



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

School of Global Studies

The Global-Local Dynamics within the Localisation of the Sustainable Development Goals

A comparative study among localities within Sweden and the
Netherlands to reflect on Global Responsibility

Master Thesis in Global Studies 30p

Spring Semester 2020

Author: Cressida de Witte

Supervisor: Merritt Polk

Word Count: 19979

Abstract

Glocalisation as a concept was developed to portray the reciprocal relationship between the global and the local. The global and the local have found themselves being interdependent and connected. The concept of globalisation lacked these dynamics. An example of the interdependency between the global and the local are the Sustainable Development Goals by the United Nations, ratified in 2016. These global goals depend on implementation on a regional, national, and especially on the local level due to their non-binding nature. The goals showcase global responsibility, are perceived as important in the road towards sustainable development, and have, therefore, become integrated in local strategies. This study explores how global responsibility within the Sustainable Development Goals is played out on the local level in Sweden and the Netherlands. Five local authorities and two overarching municipal organisations have been analysed, including interviews and strategic documents, in this research. Results show that the global goals are not necessarily perceived as difficult to translate to a local level but do rely on the interpretation of each municipality. This produces individual approaches, strategies and results. This heterogeneous nature of localisation does, however, cause difficulties to monitor and develop coherent and comparable reviews for the local, national and global levels. Overall, global responsibility is reflected in the localisation of the Sustainable Development Goals through the local recognition to include various actors and sectors. Yet, the local political orientation and structure is strongly influencing the ability to act upon it.

Key Words: Glocalisation, Globalisation, Sustainable Development Goals, Localisation, Global Responsibility

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank all the interviewees Amanda Östman, Eline Vermeer, Esmeralda Popkema, Ewout Oppers, Julia Widbom, Sarah Johnstone, Sara Petterson and Ydwine Willemsma for making some of their valuable time available to participate in my research. A special thanks goes to Martin Fierant for helping me brainstorm for my thesis topic and providing me with contacts, as well as Marianne Poelman and Sarah Johnstone. Another thanks goes to my supervisor Merritt Polk for giving me valuable feedback and directing me through the writing process. I would also like to express a special thanks to my friends Bo, Erika, Hedvig, Johanna, Sabrina and Tanja for improving my thesis with their feedback.

Abbreviations

CSR- Corporate Sustainable Responsibility

EU – European Union

GTLRG – Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments

MDGs – Millennium Development Goals

QTAD – Qualitative Text Analysis Design

RKA – Rådet för främjande av kommunala analyser

SD – Sustainable Development

SDGs – Sustainable Development Goals

SKR – Sveriges Kommuner och Regioner

SWF – [municipality of] Súdwest-Fryslân

UCLG – United Cities and Local Governments

UN – United Nations

UNDP – United Nations Development Programme

UNEP – United Nations Environment Programme

VNG – Vereniging van Nederlandse Gemeenten

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Abbreviations	iv
1. Introduction	1
2. Aim & Research Question.....	3
2.1 Aim	3
2.2 Research Questions.....	3
2.3 Delimitations	4
2.4 Relevance for Global Studies	5
3. Background	6
3.1 Sustainable Development.....	6
3.2 [Local] Agenda 21	6
3.3 Sustainable Development Goals	7
4. Previous Research	9
4.1 Localising the Sustainable Development Goals	9
4.1.1 Tools	10
4.2 Criticism around the [localisation of the] Sustainable Development Goals.....	12
5. The Concept of Globalisation versus the Concept of Glocalisation	15
5.1 The Concept of Globalisation.....	15
5.2 The Evolution of the Concept of Glocalisation	17
5.2.1 Spatial Understanding of Glocalisation	19
5.3 Translation of Global Ideas to a Local Level	22
6. Methodology	24
6.1 Case Study	24
6.1.1 Participants.....	25
6.2 Text Analysis.....	27

6.3 Ethical considerations	28
7. Results and Analysis	29
7.1 Stage One: Planning and Integrating the Sustainable Development Goals into Local Strategies	32
7.1.1 Interdependence between goals, departments and sectors	33
7.1.2 Global versus Local	36
7.1.3 Short versus Long Term Aims	42
7.2 Stage Two: Monitoring of [local] Indicators	44
8. Concluding Discussion.....	48
8.1 Further Research.....	50
9. References	51
Appendix	58
Appendix 1 – The Sustainable Development Goals.....	58
Appendix 2 – Semi-structured Interview Questions.....	60
Appendix 3 – Interview Participants	61

1. Introduction

Global Responsibility is a frequently used term in corporate businesses, education, and most importantly, the discussion surrounding sustainability. The term is often linked with Corporate Sustainable Responsibility (CSR) or Global Responsible Leadership. Within global responsible leadership, the wider global interconnectedness and context is considered while making decisions. As well as recognising the urge for economic, environmental, and societal improvement (Trott 2011). Global Responsibility is not only important within CSR, but is also crucial in global governance and responsible innovation. Global responsible governance presumes that responsibility for sustainable development is shared between private and public actors (Voegtlin and Scherer 2015). These dynamics are portrayed in the creation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by the United Nations during the Rio+20 conference in 2015. This post-2015 Agenda was meant to be more inclusive, fill gaps, and improve the shortcomings of its forerunner, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The SDGs have a long-term sustainability aim to interconnect and integrate several areas and sectors (Weitz, et al. 2014). The SDGs need to be addressed within policy implementation, production processes, and services to advance the living standards in developing countries without requiring sacrifice from the so-called developed countries and impacting the environment negatively (Voegtlin and Scherer 2015). Within this thesis, I will use global responsibility as an overarching term to explore how it is played out in the Sustainable Development Goals through localisation. The SDGs are perceived as an important set of goals for each level of governance. Therefore, there has been a strong focus on the localisation of the SDGs to make them effective worldwide (Stafford-Smith, et al. 2017).

To correctly evaluate the political localisation process of the SDGs and relate this to global responsibility, the concepts of globalisation and glocalisation are compared in this thesis. Overall, globalisation has strongly influenced global governance, intensified and internationalised world-wide connections, and allowed a platform for international initiatives, such as the SDGs. (Kraidy 2003; Keil 1998; Scholte 2005; Hirst, et al. 2009; Lemos and Argawal 2006). Yet, the concept of globalisation lacks the inclusion of local level and an adequate portrayal the complexity of worldwide relations. Therefore, Robertson (2012) introduced the concept of glocalisation to more deeply comprehend the temporal and spatial dimension in society. Glocalisation highlights the theoretical and spatial understanding of the local and global in their relational and reciprocal process (Kraidy 2003; Roudometof 2016). The two levels are interconnected and dependent on each other. Glocalisation shows a twin

process of a top-down and bottom-up political approaches where global governance is combined with receptivity (Swyndegouw 2004; Kefalas 1998). A successful global implementation of the SDGs depends on local responsiveness and responsibility. Hence, the inclusion of glocalisation in the search for global responsibility on a local level through the implementation of the SDGs is of significance for research and in this thesis. Glocalisation will enable an understanding of the local-global dynamics within the SDGs and provides space to elaborate on the unique actions between local authorities since it is not limited to homogeneous actions (Czarniawska 2002).

More research is needed to explore the drivers and obstacles within the localisation process of the SDGs by local authorities. Accordingly, the thesis includes empirical examples to reflect on the concept of glocalisation within the operationalisation of the Sustainable Development Goals and connect it with global responsibility. In total, five local authorities and two overarching municipal organisations within Sweden and the Netherlands participated in this research. These empirical cases within Western high-income countries will provide information regarding their experiences, understanding, and interpretations of the SDGs. These empirical cases will showcase the local and global relationship including the interconnectedness between the various SDGs and different stakeholders. By connecting empirical examples with academic research, the thesis contributes in confirming as well as disproving certain academic conclusions, such as the expected translation difficulties defined by Stafford-Smith, et al. (2017), around the localisation of the SDGs.

The analysis is divided into two parts regarding the localisation process supported by research from Revi, et al. (2016). First, the analysis will look at the planning and implementation process of the SDGs by examining the interdependencies between goals and actors, the long- and short-term strategies of, and the global-local relationship within the SDGs. Second, the analysis will analyse the issues around the monitoring process and its challenges of the SDGs among localities in Sweden and the Netherlands. Overall, the localisation of the SDGs, including the monitoring system, aligns with the process of glocalisation and brings opportunities as well as challenges for local authorities regarding their global responsibility towards sustainable development (SD).

2. Aim & Research Question

2.1 Aim

The main aim of the thesis is to explore how glocalisation and global responsibility is expressed through the localisation of the SDGs on a local level in two Western high-income countries. It will do so by analysing the interdependence and reciprocal relationship between the local and the global on a political-strategic level during the operationalisation processes of the Sustainable Development Goals. By including the concepts of globalisation and glocalisation, the political global-local dynamics, and their interconnection are examined. The thesis studies whether global responsibility is influenced by the global-local dynamics of glocalisation within the localisation of the SDGs.

The importance of local ownership through localisation of the global SDGs among society, and the public and private sector is highlighted by the UN and various scholars (UN Habitat, et al. 2015; Steiner 2017; Stafford-Smith, et al. 2015; Revi, et al. 2016; Bowen, et al. 2015). This study focusses on the SDG localisation processes within municipalities in two Western high-income countries. These cases were chosen since they should have greater opportunities to integrate the SDGs than less affluent countries due to their access to certain resources and could lead into an increased response to global responsibility. The empirical study is based on a text analysis of interviews, strategic documents, and websites of the participating organisations. It includes five local authorities and two overarching municipal organisations in Sweden and the Netherlands that have already worked with sustainable development and have taken certain actions in localising the SDGS. By including various best-case examples, the thesis will build upon the academic criticism around the SDGs and add empirical insights. The discussion will explore the potential success of the SDGs. By incorporating the local-global nexus, short-long term contradictions, monitoring challenges while reviewing the operationalisation processes of the SDGs on a local level, the thesis looks how localisation responds to global responsibility.

2.2 Research Questions

The main question leading this thesis will be: *How is global responsibility within the Sustainable Development Goals expressed on a local level in Sweden and the Netherlands?*

Two sub-questions will be used to answer the main question and structure the analysis:

- 1) What factors influence the operationalisation of the SDGs on the local level?
- 2) How does the global-local relationship challenge the monitoring processes of the SDGs?

These questions will be discussed in two separate parts within the analysis and reflect the two steps of localisation suggested by Revi, et al. (2016). By elaborating on the different factors, such as driving forces, short- and long-term contradictions, interconnection between local-global, etc., around planning and implementing, the first question analyses how these factors respond to global responsibility. The second question analyses the emerging difficulties around monitoring the SDGs, which remains linked to the local-global reciprocal relationship, and demonstrates that local monitoring is essential to stimulate action around global responsibility.

2.3 Delimitations

I have tried to develop an in-depth understanding of the concept of glocalisation, but do recognise that it is difficult to create a summary of the concept. I would argue that conceptualising glocalisation has a tendency to become vague. Besides this, I have noticed that the glocalisation discussion is generally focussed on marketing and economic dynamics. Literature on the political aspects of glocalisation is limited and slightly outdated since most of it is written between 2000 and 2010. Despite its weaknesses, the concept remains a significant tool in order to comprehend the SDG localisation processes and answer the research question. It still provides a solidified understanding of the different scholarly interpretations and presents the interaction between the local and global. This will be used to understand the current political localisation processes of the SDGs.

Besides this, the empirical research of this thesis contains a total of seven interviews conducted in two western high-income countries, which can be considered a weakness. This limited number of interviews in this particular area has, however, been a thoroughly considered choice. This research aims to have an in-depth focus in a particular area with similar local authorities to discover commonalities and differences within their various integration methods. Its decision to focus on two Western high-income countries is due to their opportunities and responsibility regarding SD and the integration of the SDGs. I am aware that the same resources and authorised local governments portrayed in my cases do not exist worldwide and, therefore, generalisation is not advisable.

Lastly, the complete and transcribed interviews are not included in the appendix but are available upon request. Overall, I unfortunately had to compress or exclude certain interesting insights from offered by the interviewees, as well as relevant documents, due to my particular focus and restricted word count. Some additional secondary sources have been added in the footnotes.

2.4 Relevance for Global Studies

The Sustainable Development Goals by the UN have been ratified in 2016. These goals represent an ambitious plan signed by numerous world leaders regarding equality, environment, poverty, etc. These themes are, at the same time, central issues to Global Studies. This research focusses on connecting several academic discussions, such as glocalisation, globalisation, SDGs, and global responsibility, that are central to the field of Global Studies. The main discussion is on the concept of glocalisation and the operationalisation of localising the SDGs. The need for local integration and implementation of the SDGs has been expressed and recognised from the beginning (Slack 2015). Yet, all goals need to be locally adoption. This constant reliance and connection between the local and the global is best reflected with the concept of glocalisation. Within this concept, the global impact and the intersectionality with the local society is expressed (Hettne 2009).

Linking the local challenges, emerging complexities, interpretations, and the local-global relationship exposed by the SDGs with global responsibility, contributes new insights. It not only becomes valuable for the field of Global Studies and general academics but is also relevant for local authorities.

3. Background

A brief introduction of sustainable development and its introduction in international governance is given to understand the current dynamics of the Sustainable Development Goals. Sustainable development has become part of the global discussion in the past decades and it is currently impossible to imagine a (political) discussion without the inclusion of SD. Several important actions have been taken in the previous decades and the most relevant examples for this thesis are defined. This section illustrates that the role of local actors has gained importance and recognition within these global processes throughout the years.

3.1 Sustainable Development

Sustainable Development as a concept was first introduced to the vocabulary of the international community by the Brundtland Commission (1987) in the “Our Common Future Report” developed for the “World Commission on Environment and Development summit in 1987” (United Nations, 2020). The report was requested by “the General Assembly of the United Nations [to create] a global agenda for change” (Brundtland Commission 1987, 6). Overall, the World Commission on Environment and Development was the second summit concerning environment after the creation of United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in 1972 (United Nations 2020). The Brundtland Report shifted the focus towards sustainable development and was developed to introduce durable environmental strategies, encourage cooperation between countries, and included other social and economic factors. SD itself was described to be a “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (Brundtland Commission 1987, 37). Prugh, et al. (2000, 5) add that sustainability, regardless of the definition, contains an element of longevity, since “everybody wants something to persist”. Overall, the Brundtland report changed the interface of and discussion surrounding sustainable development on a political level. Yet, it has also faced criticism on its effectiveness and the lack of adoption by countries. Whereas various strategic plans were implemented on local and national level, these plans have not been consistently implemented and monitored. Nevertheless, Sneddon, et al. (2006) argue that despite its weaknesses, the Brundtland Report has been important in creating a global shared agenda for achieving ecological and social development.

3.2 [Local] Agenda 21

Since the Brundtland Report, several conferences on sustainable development were held and agreements were adopted. One major conference was in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, also known as the Earth Summit, where Agenda 21 was adopted to promote SD (United Nations 2020).

Agenda 21 is seen as a prominent action plan, which has been adopted globally. The inclusion of local governments and public participation was recognised to be essential in this agenda. The dedicated chapter, Local Agenda 21, emphasises inclusion of civil society to achieve SD. Local authorities are key actors due to their proximity to citizens. Coenen (2000) argues that public participation gives local authorities validity and legitimacy since they mirror the people's values. Thereby, the "quality of decision making" is increased and participation empowers people through knowledge-sharing (Ibid, 4). In 2002, an evaluation report concluded that, globally, more than 6 000 local governments had integrated or initiated activities on SD as a result of the Local Agenda 21 (Revi, et al. 2016).

3.3 Sustainable Development Goals

Discussions and conferences around sustainable development continued following Agenda 21 and further agreements were made. First, the MDGs were adopted to eradicate poverty in 2000 to be accomplished by 2015. The goals mainly focussed on the countries that are most in need (United Nations n.d.c). The MDGs received criticism and there were significant problems "arising from fragmentation and siloed implementation" (Nilsson, et al. 2018, 1490). Not only the exclusive focus on the Global South, but also the ignorance towards long-term sustainability, the interconnectedness between sectors, and the overlapping negative and positive impacts were criticised (Weitz, et al. 2014). During the UN Sustainable Development Summit, held in 2015, the "Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" (United Nations 2015), also known as the Sustainable Development Goals, was published and eventually ratified in 2016 (Jones and Comfort 2019, 132). The SDGs originally contained 17 goals, 169 targets, and 242 indicators (Mair, et al. 2017). They have since been refined and two indicators have been added at the "48th session of the United Nations Statistical Commission held in March 2017" (United Nations 2017). Nine indicators are repeated under various targets and, therefore, the number of unique indicators is 232¹.

The criticism of the MDGs and recognised need for fuller integration of areas and sectors was answered by the creation of the SDGs. The process towards creating the SDGs included dialogues between different stakeholders on various levels, such as local communities, to form a transformative, universal, and integrative post-2015 agenda. The SDGs aim for long-term sustainability compared to the short-term focus of the MDGs. The universal nature of the goals should increase the number of opportunities for countries to execute the targets according to

¹ The refined Global Indicator Framework from 2017 is used as the main reference in this thesis regarding the SDGs. The goals are summarised in the appendix.

their priorities and needs, depending on their resources (Weitz, et al. 2014; Bowen, et al. 2017; UN-Habitat, et al. 2015). The SDGs are created to “end poverty, fight inequality and injustice, and tackle climate change by 2030” (Global Taskforce, et al. n.d., 2). The goals reflect the three aspects of sustainable development, namely, environment social, and economic (Jones and Comfort 2019, 133).

After the creation of the SDGs, and the integration of local input, the UNDP called for local implementation (Steiner 2017). Here, according to Revi, et al. (2016, 15) “local authorities and local stakeholders [...] adapt and implement these targets within cities and human settlements”. Localisation takes local governments into account as partners for “co-creating and defining policy and pragmatic responses” (Ibid, 15) as well as monitoring the development of the goals. Hence, Revi, et al (2016, 16/17) evaluate the localisation of the SDGs as two processes, planning/implementation and monitoring, while mentioning four different incentives for local governments to adopt the SDGs: “1) leave no one behind; 2) leave no place behind; 3) access to development resources; 4) a sustainable development roadmap for mayors and local leaders”. Similar to Agenda 21, Coenen (2000) argues that the SDGs are an influential strategy on the road towards sustainable development. The SDGs can be extended on these Local Agenda 21 processes.

4. Previous Research

The strong emphasis on the localisation of the SDGs requires an understanding of the perception of localisation by institutions and academia. Whereas institutions have mostly been positive and ambitious about the localisation of the SDGs, scholars express certain criticism. Here, I will give an overview of both sides to connect it with the concept of glocalisation and reflect on global responsibility in my analysis in order to contribute to the localisation discussion.

4.1 Localising the Sustainable Development Goals

Most critical objectives and challenges of the Post-2015 Development Agenda will certainly depend on local action, community buy-in and local leadership, well-coordinated at and with all levels of governance... Accountable local governments can promote strong local partnerships with all local stakeholders – civil society, private sector, etc. Integrated and inclusive local development planning that involves all stakeholders is a key instrument to promoting ownership and the integration of the three dimensions of development – social, economic and environment.

Helen Clark, Chair of the United Nations Development Group (UN Habitat, et al. 2015, 4)

Similar to other UN agendas, the SDGs are not legally binding and, therefore, depend on national and local actions to translate and implement the goals. This makes the inclusion of multiple levels essential (Galli, et al. 2018). In line with Clark's statement (UN Habitat, et al. 2015), the SDGs incorporated local consultation in the development process and included a separate goal that focusses on local governments. Goal 11, specifically, is created to ensure sustainable and durable living standards in cities and human settlements (United Nations 2017). However, all of the SDG goals are interlinked and relevant for local implementation and action. The integration of local authorities, besides national governments and other public and private stakeholders, within the SDG establishment process arose after criticism was expressed around the creation and execution of the MDGs. The MDGs were considered to be too exclusive and unequally successful (Reddy 2016). The importance of local integration has been expressed by different authorities, organisations, and scholars. For example, the United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) group adds that the role of local governments goes beyond the implementation of the SDGs. They are also "policymakers, catalysts of change and the level of government best-place to link the global goals with local communities" (United Cities and Local Governments 2015, 2). Overall, a strong focus on localising the SDGs is important,

otherwise these goals would just remain ambitious and ineffective without ensured implementation (Stafford-Smith, et al. 2017).

The localisation of the SDGs can be summarised as a “process of adapting, implementing, and monitoring the SDGs at the local level” (Revi, et al. 2016, 16). Achim Steiner (2017), UNDP administrator, adds that this goes beyond ‘dropping’ global ratified goals on the local. Most importantly the SDGs should be executed and become relatable and relevant to communities and individuals. By analysing two steps within the localisation process, Revi, et al. (2016) provide a basic structure to governments: 1) planning/implementation, where strategies regarding locally-adapted goals are defined, planned and integrated, and; 2) monitoring, where the progress of implementation is reviewed. This includes “geographic and demographic disaggregation of data for relevant outcome-based targets [...] to ensure that we leave no one behind” (Revi, et al. 2016, 16). Both steps are relevant for the analysis within this research.

Steiner (2017) elaborates on “five drivers of transformational change” through the localisation of the SDGs that developed from the criticism around the MDGs. These five drivers eventually support global responsibility through the inclusion of a variety of actors. The drivers are: 1) knowledge about the SDGs and engagement among local actors leading to good governance and active participation; 2) commitment on each governance level through accountability; 3) integrate inclusion of local actors since it is key to planning and monitoring on a local level and leads to motivated participation; 4) increase of local economic development to fulfil the goals and reflect improvement to communities; 5) creation of partnerships on various levels and with various stakeholders. Partnerships are valuable to help guide strategic priorities, action on shared aims and greater international development (Steiner 2017).

4.1.1 Tools

Several organisations on different levels of governance have developed tools and programmes to guide local governments with the localisation of the SDGs. These tools demonstrate the global and national support to local authorities to act upon global responsibility. Here, a few relevant examples are illustrated to portray the steps of localisation by Revi, et al. (2016) on a global and national level.

Roadmap “localising the SDGs”(Global)

The Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments (GTLRG) was established in 2013 to coordinate and support “the major international networks of local governments” (Global Taskforce, et al. n.d.). They created a toolbox for local authorities to localise the SDGs. Part of

this toolbox is a roadmap, which includes a variety of strategies for local-integration. The roadmap explores four steps, including “1) awareness-raising; 2) advocacy; 3) implementation, and; 4) monitoring” (Ibid, 3) and adds advice on future actions. Each step’s importance is defined and the SDG projects from around the world are shown as examples. The four steps are described to be elementary for effectively and successfully implement the SDGs on a local level. First, awareness creates ownership and encourages citizen participation. Second, local advocacy opens up bottom-up integration. National governments are expected to provide an environment for localisation by including “a legal and political framework; a legislative body and level of decentralisation; multi-level governance; and, recognition of the need to make financial transfers” (Ibid, 18). Third, the SDGs should be implemented according to local priorities while complementing national strategies. The implementation includes different means elaborated by the GTLRG. Finally, monitoring the indicators adopted by local governments which are adjusted to their needs will increase accountability (Ibid).²

Planning: Campaign Municipalities for Global Goals (the Netherlands)

The overarching organisation for municipalities in the Netherlands, Vereniging voor Nederlandse Gemeenten (VNG), has launched the campaign ‘Municipalities for Global Goals’ (Gemeenten 4 Global Goals). This campaign is dedicated to municipalities within the Netherlands and includes different materials. The ‘Global Goals in municipal policy’ is an enhanced document where the VNG has localised the SDGs into Dutch policy. For each goal, existing and relevant Dutch policies, the role of municipalities and additional advice are given as a guideline (VNG International 2018). They have also created a ‘menu’ with suggestions on how to commit to the Global Goals in joint effort with their residents. It suggests three clusters of opportunities: 1) raising awareness; 2) supporting and connecting platforms, and; 3) using policy as a role model (VNG International and European Commission n.d.). Another initiative is the so-called ‘time-capsule’ where municipalities can exchange a symbolic capsule to add SDG ambitions together with their civil society (VNG International n.d.). Besides this, they offer examples of different approaches executed by Dutch municipalities (VNG n.d.). These tools reflect the first process defined by Revi, et al. (2016). These reports, with suggested action tools, are used by Dutch municipalities to design, organise and implement the SDGs into their strategies.

² A report has been established by UCLG around the localisation of specific targets and indicators, selected on their relevance to local governments. United Cities and Local Governments. Post-2015: How to Localize Targets and Indicators (1st Draft). Global Taskforce Working Paper, Global Taskforce of Local Governments, 2014. (www.uclg.org/sites/default/files/localization_targets_indicator_web.pdf)

Monitoring: Kolada (Sweden)

The Swedish government also recognises the need for assisting local authorities to implement the SDGs and has incorporated measures for municipal support in their Action Plan 2018-2020. The RKA (Rådet för främjande av kommunala analyser) was asked to lead the creation of a report for municipalities, in cooperation with different actors (RKA 2020). This report describes the SDGs and its relevance for communities. Each goal is elaborated with sub-goals that are translated to the Swedish situation (RKA 2019). Besides this, the RKA has been monitoring the SDG related efforts per region in Kolada annually since 2015. These statistics include the key figures described in the report by RKA (2019). The progress is reviewed and shown in percentages and a colour scheme to portray how well the region has performed on the key figures. Kolada (n.d.) mirrors the second process suggested by Revi, et al. (2016) and its emphasis to monitor the progress to successfully implement the SDGs.

4.2 Criticism around the [localisation of the] Sustainable Development Goals

Even though the SDGs have tried to integrate the local voice and incorporated the MDGs feedback, the goals still face criticism that needs to be incorporated in my analysis. Overall, the SDGs are contested due to their subjectivity and political sensitivity. Their subjectivity originates in the definitions and expected actions according to the following concepts. Sustainability, for example, “deals with heavily value-laden issues including the proper relationship between society and the nature and from one generation to another” (Mair, et al. 2017, 3). Development, on the other hand, is “an ill-defined term” (Ibid, 3). Weitz, et al. (2014) add that development is only sustainable when the interlinkages between resources, environment, sectors and areas is acknowledged. These interlinkages are recognised by the SDGs, after reflecting the MDG criticism, and they do view development as a global responsibility. Yet, the goals are still sensitive to inequality. While it will be easier for some countries to realise the goals, others can only aspire them due to economic and social inequalities (Ibid)

The 17 SDGs subsume 169 targets and 242 indicators. They are monitored through different indicators. The use of indicators is criticised and perceived as ambitious to measure the important aspects of the agenda (Mair, et al. 2017). Indicators are usually used and combined to understand, interpret, and inform us about a system. In the case of a contested concept, indicators often have conflicting meanings in relation to the system’s functions and can only illustrate a limited scope of the different perceptions. Hence, Mair, et al. (2017, 4) argue that “an indicator of a contested system should not be understood as a piece of information about a

system, but a piece of information reflecting how an individual or group conceptualises that system”. Overall, monitoring remains a burden for (local) governments (Reyers, et al. 2017). It is challenging for the indicators to reflect different aspects in relation to each other as well as to a global dynamic. Therefore, Adams and Judd (2016) recognise that the current global (monitoring) framework is a comparative system to monitor and evaluate the SDGs but might not be suitable for all levels of governance. To avoid the establishment of uncoordinated systems, Reyers, et al. (2017) emphasise the need for a coherent and representative monitoring system to be able to evaluate and compare the SDG progress.

The issue of monitoring also stems from the SDGs being characterised as a complex set of goals where many goals, targets, and indicators are intertwined. Weitz, et al. (2014) argue that the SDGs have merely focused on a top-down process by setting overarching goals and adding targets and indicators to help to accomplish the goal. This setup ignores the interlinkage between sectors and actors plus makes interaction and coordination complicated. The acknowledgment of the interlinkage between and across sectors, societal actors, and countries is essential for greater achievement and less internal conflicts (Stafford-Smith, et al. 2017). At the same time, the often contradicting targets risk the development of contrasting initiatives. Weitz, et al. (2014) discuss that these contradictions could be limited by concentrating on specific targets rather than the overarching goal. This would “stimulate discussion on the scope of development issues, not sectoral challenges, and enables interactions to emerge” (Ibid, 39). These interactions could stimulate more consistent decisions on the SDGs. Stafford-Smith, et al. (2017) discuss the crucial role of national governments in linking sectors and creating consistent policy.

The complexity of the SDGs and the dependency on national and local accountability is also criticised by Stafford, et al. (2017). Each country is encouraged to respond with ambitious plans. However, a focus on integration is missing. This lack of guidance and the complex nature of the SDGs could eventually lead to the cherry-picking of goals while prioritising short-term goals aligning with national policies rather than focussing on long-term and demanding goals. Whereas cherry-picking was already criticised about the MDGs and the SDGs were created to include everyone (Stuart and Woodroffe 2016), the risk is still apparent. Overall, Stafford-Smith, et al. (2017) argue that national governments should be aware that inadequate short-term policies could eventually negatively influence long-term progress, which is a similar peril for local authorities.

The localisation of the SDGs also causes governance challenges during their implementation. Three governance challenges, which require attention, have been elaborated by Bowen, et al. (2017). These challenges link the complexity of the SDGs with the deeply rooted political structures. The first challenge is “cultivating collective action by creating inclusive decision spaces for stakeholder interaction across multiple sectors and scales” (90). This call for interaction is in line with Stafford-Smith, et al. (2017) and Weitz, et al. (2014). However, collective action face issues as well. First, they define a “coordination problem [which affirms] institutional economics and public choice”. Second, the “political problem [would] emphasise political behaviour among actors with diverse and often competing interests” (Bowen, et al. 2017, 91). The SDGs demand the inclusion of different stakeholders, such as the private sector, which leads to challenges regarding power inequality. These gaps should be taken into consideration and resolved by actions. The second governance challenge is “making difficult trade-offs focusing on equity, justice, and fairness” (Ibid, 90). This challenge is closely linked to the cherry-picking phenomenon pointed out earlier and relates to my research question. Governments will have to sacrifice certain indicators to achieve progress on others when these indicators cannot be accomplished jointly. The final governance challenge “is ensuring accountability for commitments made by nations, communities, organisations, and other parties to SDG-related agreements” (Ibid, 92). All three challenges are interlinked and influence each other.

Overall, it is difficult to create a set of goals that is perfect. Therefore, it is necessary to be aware of the positive aspects as well as the criticism of these goals. A critical approach towards the SDGs will limit inefficiency and misinterpretations, lead to well considered actions, and constructive results. It can be argued that localised actions and ownership will generate global responsibility. The observations made in this section will be evaluated and connected with the empirical study in my analysis. It will help reflecting the operationalisation of the SDGs by local authorities and the expression of global responsibility.

5. The Concept of Globalisation versus the Concept of Glocalisation

The main aim of the thesis, as well as its contribution to the ongoing academic discourse, is to explore how the concept of glocalisation expresses notions of global responsibility within local applications of the SDGs. Global responsibility refers to implementation where global interconnectedness and context are linked during decision-making while including various actors and sectors (Trott 2011). To further explore the political strategy regarding the localisation of the SDGs and eventually connect it with global responsibility, the discussion around globalisation versus glocalisation becomes invaluable. It helps to understand the challenges of the local-global dynamics of politics, economics, and culture since they are interlinked. The focus here will be mainly on the political and spatial aspects of glocalisation. However, globalisation will be introduced first since this process has paved the way for the creation of the SDGs and strongly influences glocalisation. Glocalisation, on the other hand, will further define the implementation processes and is therefore necessary for the research.

5.1 The Concept of Globalisation

The processes of globalisation have been essential in the development of international governance. Globalisation as a phenomenon has been argued to be present in history for a long time, but has only made its appearance in academia in the early 1980s (Kraidy 2003). The concept of globalisation became fashionable in politics, the private sector and social science. This concept is argued to have dissolved national borders, economies and cultures where social life is now driven by global pressures (Hirst, et al. 2009). Globalisation can be defined in various ways. Even though Keil (1998, 619) argues that it is challenging to analytically define the concept, he recognises that globalisation encloses and can be interpreted through “ideological and analytical dimensions”. Keil (1998) goes on to explain that the ideological dimension is represented in neoliberal theories where globalisation is seen as a natural process through the internationalisation of the economy. The analytical dimension, on the other hand, is connected to political economy theories and defines globalisation as “a top-down process of determination” (Ibid, 620). Related to the main focus of the thesis, the political-economic aspects of the concepts will be examined here.

Globalisation is conceptualised by various scholars as describing the internationalisation of political and economic processes. Scholte (2005) defines globalisation as being driven by capitalism due to the global division of production and global finance. Standing (2014) adds that the influence of the liberalisation of markets and the prioritisation of competition has driven

globalisation. Kellner (2002, 285) outlines that globalisation constructs a current world order where the “dominance of a world capitalist economic system” is strengthened. The supremacy of nation-states is replaced by international businesses and organisations, and a global culture deteriorates local cultures. Kraidy (2003, 35), while summarising Giddens, emphasises that globalisation is “the intensification of world-wide social relations” where faraway localities are linked and shape each other. Robertson, on the other hand, comprehends it as a “compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole” (Ibid, 35). Hirst, et al. (2009, 9) elaborate on seven interpretations of globalisation whereof two are relevant for the discussion around global economics and its governance. One development is the creation of a “supra-state regional economic and social configurations or blocs”, such as the European Union. Those institutions are relevant in providing opportunities to connect the local and global. The other displays that “multilateral interdependency and integration between essentially independent economies or societies” continue (Ibid, 10).

Overall, the concept globalisation is perceived differently by various academics, from sceptics to radicals (Giddens 2002). Whereas the sceptics do not believe in the rise of ‘globalisation’ and its impacts, the radicals go as far as to argue that nation-states have lost their sovereign power. Giddens (2002) clarifies that these two groups misunderstand globalisation as being purely economic. On the contrary, Radhakrishnan (2010) adds that within sociology, globalisation has been mostly constituted by social and political aspects. Globalisation leads to an integrated world, which will continue modifying the local environment (Czarniawska 2002). In addition, Lemos and Agrawal (2006) also include the environment into the globalisation discussion. Globalisation has positive as well as negative impacts on the environment. On the one hand, the environment has been affected by the internationalised production and trade on various levels. On the other hand, interconnected and international governance can create global environmental policy initiatives that exert pressure on actors to participate. This aspect has been important in the creation of the SDGs. These resulting processes of international governance, such as the SDGs, will be analysed in the thesis by examining its global responsibility.

International governance somewhat aligns the perception of the radicals portrayed by Giddens (2002). The local and national levels might not have fully lost their influence on the global level, but the processes of globalisation pull upwards as push downwards, thereby “creating new pressures for local autonomy” (Ibid, 12). Scholte (2005) stresses that globalisation has changed our understanding of sovereignty and governance. Within governance, the public sectors and unofficial actors have increased their influence. The nation-states have lost their

exclusive authority over “economic and social processes” (Hirst, et al. 2009, 226). Therefore, the processes of globalisation have been essential in the creation of, for example, the UN and its various departments protecting different rights and sectors. For the discussion around the localisation of the SDGs, it is meaningful to comprehend the controversial criticism around globalisation to understand the need for a separate concept. Hirst, et al. (2009, 3) sum up five arguments against the current globalisation ‘hype’. They argue that 1) the global economy has been more integrated before the concept appeared in academia; 2) transnational companies are still operating from a national or regional base, making a local focus essential; 3) countries are unequally benefitting from global investments; 4) Western regions and Japan/East Asia primarily dominate the global economy, and; 5) global markets are strongly influenced by the dominant powers and their governance. These arguments show that globalisation is still exclusive for some, which opposes the inclusive interconnectedness created by globalisation. In addition, Kellner (2002) argues that the concept of globalisation is often theorised as one-sided and fails to interpret the existing contradictions. Theorists are either in favour or against globalisation, and are ignoring “the interaction between technological features of globalisation and the global restructuring of capitalism or failing to articulate the complex relations between capitalism and democracy” (Ibid, 289). He argues that the critical movement against globalisation should incorporate the challenge to consider the local-global relationship, influence, and structure. I will be responding to these concerns by introducing the concept of glocalisation below.

5.2 The Evolution of the Concept of Glocalisation

Before engaging in the discussion around glocalisation, it is important to note that glocalisation is not necessarily defined as a theory according to Roudometof (2016). Although scholars have tried to interpret and engage with the concept due to its popularity, the concept has not distinctively been theorised (Roudometof 2016). Yet, the discussion around the concept of glocalisation is valuable to this thesis to understand the global-local nexus within the global responsibility created by the SDGs. Therefore, this concept will be elaborated on and used to contribute to the discussion around the expression of global responsibility within the local operationalisation of the SDGs.

Generally, the concept of glocalisation appeared in the social and human sciences in the nineties as an elaboration on and opponent of the concept of globalisation. The emergence of globalisation was adopted by most states as “an act of faith”, where each level of governance took action to align their policies to the competitive sphere (Swyngedouw 2004, 27). However,

Robertson (2012) argues that the concept of globalisation failed to interpret the complex international dynamics while prevailing the local. Robertson (2012, 193) continues by raising the neglect within globalisation of including and connecting the “temporal and spatial dimensions of human life”. Therefore, Robertson introduced the concept of glocalisation (Khondker 2005). The origin of the concept of glocalisation derives from the “Japanese agricultural and business practices of global localisation, [where] a global outlook [is] adapted to local conditions” (Kraidy 2003, 37). Glocalisation does not see the local and the global as opposites. Glocalisation illustrates the “relational and reciprocal process[es] whose dynamics are mutually formative” (Kraidy 2003, 38). Hence, Khondker (2005, 187) recognised that by overcoming space “globalisation is glocalisation”. Within this nexus, a top-down process is still existing according to Roudometof (2016). He argues that global ideas and dialogues are translated to a national level, particularly within those that have strong international connections, and is perceived as dominant and legitimate. Yet, the concept of glocalisation offers the flexibility of heterogeneous translation (Czarniawska 2002). Overall, glocalisation is argued by Bauman 1998, 43) to be “a redistribution of privileges and deprivation, of wealth and poverty, resources and impotence, of power and powerlessness, of freedom and constraint”. The concept gives the local an identity and has led to the reorganisation of sovereignty and authority (Ibid).

Swyngedouw (2004) divides glocalisation into a twin process of economic and political/institutional dimensions. Economically, international corporations and their networks will become more localised as well as globally reorganised. Politically, “institutional/regulatory arrangements shift from the national scale both upwards to supra-national or global scales and downwards to the scale of the individual body or to local, urban or regional configurations” (Ibid, 25). Hence, Swyngedouw (2004) prefers using the concept of glocalisation over globalisation. Khondker (2005) argues that the inclusion of the locality, such as local culture, practices, and principles, is essential to make the concept of glocalisation valid. Glocalisation allows the recognition of the simultaneous appearance of local and global processes where both are influenced by each other (Czarniawska 2014). The local cannot be perceived as pure or independent from the global and will always be respondent to global influences. The local and the global are connected and complement each other while competing independently in search for influence (Kraidy 2003). Glocalisation includes “blending, mixing adapting of two or more processes one of which must be local” (Khondker 2005, 191). This reciprocal relationship is defined to be one out of three twofold relationships between the local and global where the local

is perceived a significant ‘partner’ to the global and the two are combined and defined as glocal (Roudometof 2019). The importance and recognition of glocal processes through glocalisation is valuable in the discussion around the SDGs and the expression of global responsibility by local authorities in my analysis.

5.2.1 Spatial Understanding of Glocalisation

The wording, such as local, glocal and global, solicits questions about their interpretations and spatial relationships, which could lead to confusion when illustrating them. Their differences need to be elaborated to understand the dynamics of the municipalities presented in the following analysis, as well as to be able to relate to the discussion around local global responsibility played out by the SDGs. By examining the spatial discussion, the research questions can elaborate on, for example, the local-global relationship within the localisation of the SDGs while limiting potential misinterpretations of the glocal.

Looking at the Oxford dictionary, the words themselves have been defined differently. ‘Local’ is a specific place or region that people feel connected (Oxford Learner's Dictionaries n.d.c). ‘Glocal’, on the other hand, is described as having global as well as local characteristics or correlating factors (Oxford Learner's Dictionaries n.d.b). ‘Global’ is everything that covers or affects the entire world (Oxford Learner's Dictionaries n.d.a). The Oxford Learner’s Dictionary definition of the local is similar to the realist perception of linking locality to a geographic location, which is connected to the understanding of space as being tangible and/or abstract. Within the realist understanding, the local and the global are hierarchical and can easily be separated. The constructivists, on the other hand, perceive space as socially constructed, including social relations and, therefore, not abstract (Roudometof 2019).

Roudometof (2019) emphasises the difference between space and place within the discussion surrounding locality. Place is connected with locality by humanist geographers. It relates to the feeling of belonging and value attributed to a certain location by humans, such as municipalities. Space, on the other hand, is a location that is not necessarily socially associated with humans. The space-place discussion can be associated with the introduction of the concept of globalisation. Place has become important within this discourse, since space is being conceived as a cause of the disappearance of place. Even though the two terms seem to have oppositional definitions, they are not necessarily contradictory (Ibid). Roudometof (2019, 806) argues that “in fact, globalisation itself is often related to the notion of the world becoming a single place”. Questions then arise what makes the local to be considered a place in a unified global world. Gieryn (2000) describes the inclusion of a geographic location, physicality and connection of

value to be attributes to a place. The link between space and place is defined by Gieryn (2000, 465) as follows: “space is what place becomes when unique gathering of things, meanings, and values are sucked out [whereas] place is space filled up by people, practices, objects, and representation”. Roudometof’s (2019) understanding of space and place allows locality to be defined as a physical entity and will help in the discussion around locality, globality, and glocality, where both become intertwined. His understanding prompts us to look beyond the original perception of place.

Within the discussion around glocalisation, the ‘local’ is importantly not the same as the ‘glocal’. The definition of the local being a place would make it easier to distinguish the local from the glocal. However, these two are still connected and theoretically intertwined. Roudometof (2016) argues that the distinction between local and glocal is a consequence of social processes. The local can only be perceived as analytically independent from the global when “the politics of representation suggest that a cultural form or item is not recognised as a fusion or as a bricolage but rather as belonging to a place, as ‘homemade’ or ‘traditional’” (Ibid, 809). The creation of the local is, therefore, described to be the result of social construction rather than reality. Ritzer ([2004] 2006) adds dualism into the discussion. He recognises that the glocal is created when the local is incorporated in the global but emphasises that the local in itself is not glocal. Similarly, Khondker (2005, 186) characterises two processes regarding the glocal: (1) Micro-globalisation, which is the interdependence of localising global ideas or integrating global developments into the local environment, and; (2) macro-localisation, by making local ideas global. These glocal processes reflect the local consultation in the establishment of the SDGs and its additional need to be localised. They help elaborating on the global-local dynamics around the SDGs and examine the call for global responsibility.

Micro-globalisation, localisation, or the construction of the local as a place does not automatically eliminate the potential for conflict or imbalance of interests (Roudometof 2019). Here, the presence and influence of politics is apparent and opens the discussion around localisation as part of glocalisation. Brenner (2003) suggests that localisation, in general, can be theorised as a state strategy leading to a spatial restructuring of state administrative plans at various spatial scales [within Western Europe]. Localisation offers the opportunity for global reorganisation where cities and local authorities become essential. Cities and local authorities can provide urban glocality which concentrates on “pragmatism instead of politics, innovations rather than ideology and solutions in place of sovereignty” (Barber 2013, 5). At the same time, glocality intensifies local citizenship which then attaches global belonging to it, which could

lead to global responsibility. Glocality reflects Robertson's (1992) open definition of localism where the world is not divided into closed societies but open towards globality, only then can a global world order be created. This is encouraged with the creation of the SDGs and their emphasis on localisation and local willingness to do so.

Spatial Strategy

Brenner (2003) validates the concept of glocality by elaborating that within the supranational (economic) development, the inclusion of various political strategies is needed to situate preferred subnational spaces. These political strategies help to understand state processes and relate to governmental spatial projects and strategies that improve the relationship between domestic and sub-national scales. This contributes to surmounting the localisation challenges of the SDGs. The glocalisation state strategy focusses on including global-local tensions, customising investments towards local preference, distinct economics related to local abilities, a focus on unequal development, decentralisation of socio-economic policies, etc. (Brenner 2003, 207/208). This glocalisation strategy is useful in demonstrating the different adoption methods by local authorities.

Brenner (2003) illustrates that the spatial strategy of glocalisation replaced the Keynesian strategy in the seventies as an experiment to promote development within descending industrial areas. In the following years, it evolved into a strategy that was more widely accepted. Whereas the Keynesian strategy focussed on an integrated national economy, glocalisation now uses the local to improve economic growth by rearranging regional industrial growth as well as infrastructure financing. The national authorities no longer only dominate power, but make an effort to include and institutionalise the global-local relationship by positioning and promoting local economies, which gives them a prominent place to take action. Yet, Brenner (2003) stresses that glocalisation state strategies are not identical. They vary depending on the "inherited state structures (unitary vs. federal), inherited economic arrangements (the form of post-war growth), by national and/or regional political regimes (neoliberal, centrist or social-democratic), and by nationally specific pathways of post-Fordist industrial restructuring" (Ibid, 209). Glocalisation strategy methods can be divided into two approaches. First, it can be seen as a 'state spatial project'. Here, glocalisation has changed the roles and accountability within subnational legislative levels, such as fixing institutional hierarchies. Second, glocalisation as a 'state spatial strategy' focusses on equal economic advancement by adapting economic activities to the specific region. Overall, however, Brenner (2003, 214) argues that the concept of glocalisation is not perfect and faces errors within a sustainable economic growth model and

is based on “ad-hoc strategies of crisis-management”. Yet, the concept can be evaluated and improved within spatial regulations. Sustainable economic growth through the integration of the SDGs is important and further aligns with global responsibility. Glocalisation and sustainable development will remain in a constant search for improvement.

5.3 Translation of Global Ideas to a Local Level

The discussion above demonstrates the differences between globalisation and glocalisation. It illustrates, in short, that globalisation is described to reside on homogeneous and heterogeneous factors in economic and political strategies, while affecting and modifying local strategies (Czarniawska 2002) due to the top-down process of governance. It furthermore relates to the internationalisation of the economy (Keil 1998). Global governance processes have led to the creation of global initiatives, such as the SDGs. Glocalisation, on the other hand, is introduced to offer a personalised strategy around the translation of global goals by local authorities as well as a better spatial understanding (Robertson 2012). A combination of localist and globalist views is necessary to understand the current dynamic world order (Kellner 2002). A glocalised political strategy is best understood as a twin process in which local authorities and supranational governance, the local and the global, are relational and reciprocal. They depend upon and complement each other. Therefore, Robertson sees globalisation and glocalisation as two concepts that work together and are intertwined (Khondker 2005). This discussion brings awareness to the spatial restructuring within the current world order and to renewed state strategies that are increasingly focussed on the localisation of politics (Brenner 2003). It also reflects the incentive of local authorities to conform to global goals in alignment with their global responsibility.

These strategies can and will be used in combination with analysing the localisation of the Sustainable Development Goals, published by the UN. These universal goals will require local integration. However, the local adoption and execution of the goals will not be identical and will be interpreted differently in every area. The concept of glocalisation allows such heterogeneous freedom. Czarniawska (2002) showcases that, while observing three European capitals, local tradition counteracts global and national tradition despite the excessive influence of supranational models. The local attitude will prioritise and eventually choose from various subnational ideas, which can be related to Stafford-Smith, et al.’s (2017) cherry-picking. Localisation of the SDGs is welcomed to differentiate since “the local opposes the non-local and the global invites the creation of local particularities” (Czarniawska 2002, 14). Brenner (2003) adds that cities and local authorities can mobilise a socio-economic and political strategy

adapted to their region. Therefore, the local representation of the global world order can only be validated through (g)localisation or (g)localism. Within glocalisation the local is not only influenced by global processes through localisation, but also by local variables. The motivation to incorporate global ideas into local legislation can be connected to local authorities that want to conform to global fashions (Czarniawska 2014). Therefore, in the subsequent analysis, the concept of glocalisation is understood as an expression of global responsibility within the implementation of the SDGs.

6. Methodology

This thesis is based on primary and secondary sources. The analysis is mainly founded on primary sources, including interviews with local authorities, websites and strategic documents from the organisations. It also connects the empirical findings with secondary sources reviewed in the literature review. To answer the main research question on how the appeal for global responsibility within the SDGs has been answered by local level institutions in the Netherlands and Sweden, the case study is analysed through a Qualitative Text Analysis Design³.

6.1 Case Study

The decision to include a case study is due to the opportunity to explore a “contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context” (Atkinson 2002, 1). A case study offers a practical insight into the practicalities of SDG implementation, while connecting observations with the academic discussion around glocalisation and the SDGs. The collection of empirical data through interviews and documents, while exploring a ‘how’ question, follows the case study method elaborated by Atkinson (2002). I aim to create a comparative research which explores the “similarities and differences” (Yanow, et al. 2012, 112) between municipalities in Western high-income countries in their localisation strategies and overall connection to global responsibility. Yet, I do not follow a strict comparative study. Whereas, in general, a comparative study is comparing and contrasting nations or cultures (Lewis-Beck 2004), I compare all participating municipalities with each other, regardless their country. The selected cases also experience slight differences but these did not affect the results of the analysis. On the other hand, similar to a comparative study, I intend to “contribute to theory building” (Ibid, 153) by analysing and reflecting the expression of global responsibility within the localisation of the SDGs by local authorities.

A case study method offers advantages and disadvantages. The main disadvantage is the difficulty to generalise the study due to its focus on a specific area (Zainal 2007), even though the intention of a case study is to become an example for other cases (Gerring 2004). Yet, this particular disadvantage may simultaneously be considered an advantage since it allows the focus on a particular issue which leads to more in-depth research. This presents the opportunity to elaborate on a complex “real-life situation” (Zainal 2007, 4). A case study is perceived as useful when, for example, it is preferred to have comparability rather than representativeness

³ The primary sources, in this research, such as interviews are also considered text and therefore suitable for a QTAD method.

or to have a preliminary instead of a confirmatory focus (Gerring 2004). Therefore, I concluded that the advantages overshadowed the disadvantages while remaining careful for unfounded generalisation. The conclusion of my research can be seen as informative suggestions to other local authorities rather than definite answers. I want to explore and compare the localisation experience around the SDGs between different local authorities within Western high-income countries and go into depth within these particular governments. These results are linked to the academic discussion on glocalisation and global responsibility. Hence, I focussed on a particular area within Northern Europe that has a similar governance structure. I selected comparable local institutions and interviewees with similar involvement with the SDGs in Sweden and the Netherlands. The focus on Western high-income countries evolved since a comparison between varied sized municipalities in the North has not been extensively researched regarding the localisation of the SDGs. Research on the SDGs, as well as the MDGs, mainly focussed on the Global South and the global North-South relationship (Stafford-Smith, et al. 2017). This is particularly reflected in SDG Goal 17, in which cooperation between the Global North and South is promoted (United Nations n.d.b). In line with Stafford-Smith, et al.'s (2017) criticism, I am interested in the interlinkage between and across sectors and societal actors within high-income countries.

Therefore, this research focusses on a comparison between local authorities within Sweden and the Netherlands. All participatory regions have at least familiarised themselves or already integrated the SDGs into their local strategies. These empirical cases can also be described as 'best-case' examples. A best-case is defined where the case belongs or relates "to the best of a number of possible situations or sets of circumstances" (Oxford English Dictionary n.d). The selected cases fall under this definition since they have the resources, such as finances, staff, etc., to act upon social, economic and sustainable development. In addition, the municipalities have access to information and support from overarching organisations and can apply for financial funds from supra-national organisations. These circumstances should give them the opportunity to easily adopt the SDGs and are, hence, the best possible cases to review the localisation process of the SDGs. Therefore, global responsibility can be expected to be expressed through the localisation of the SDGs in this particular area above any other part of the world, which evaluation is the main aim of this research.

6.1.1 Participants

The primary data collection includes seven organisations and municipalities within the Netherlands and Sweden. Most of the local authorities and their contacts were available through

my network. In addition, conducting interviews within Sweden and the Netherlands limited language barriers since I could either use Dutch or English. Overall, the selected municipalities are all at different stages of integrating the SDGs and hence useful for the analysis⁴. For better comparison, the various overarching organisations, urban, and more rural municipalities, as well as their various integration methods, provide a greater understanding of global responsibility within the SDGs. The respective interviews were conducted according to the semi-structure interview method by Bryman (2016). A set of questions formed the interview guide, but were not fixed⁵. They got adjusted during the interview. The interviews were either conducted in person or via Skype. All recorded interviews have been fully transcribed to limit the margin for errors and to allow easier coding. The interviewees have been selected because of their knowledge of the SDGs and involvement in SDG projects within their organisation. They could elaborate on the localisation driving forces of their organisation, short-long term contradiction, translation of goals, etc. I will briefly elaborate on and motivate the participating organisations, including a description of the interviewed representative, below.

In the Netherlands, two municipalities and one overarching municipal organisation participated. The municipality of Súdwest-Fryslân (SWF) and Leeuwarden are both located in the province of Friesland. The municipality of SWF is mostly rural and includes 82.495 inhabitants (Overheid.nl n.d.b) and has started integrating the SDGs ambitiously. I interviewed their strategic advisor/project manager of the SDGs and the programme manager of the Environment and Planning Act. The municipality of Leeuwarden includes the province capital city and has 107.342 inhabitants (Overheid.nl n.d.a). Leeuwarden has taken part in the first City Scan by the Global Compact Cities Programme (n.d.), which provides local authorities with information regarding their progress and future challenges in sustainable development while aligning it with the SDGs. This shows their interaction with the SDGs and determination to monitor. In the municipality of Leeuwarden, I spoke with an employee of the Economic Department and who works with the SDGs and international relations. Finally, the overarching organisation of municipalities in the Netherlands, the VNG, an organisation that oversees all 365 Dutch municipalities, is included. They contributed with an overarching perspective on the integration of the SDGs in the Netherlands since they have created a campaign on the global goals for all members and are in regular contact with the municipalities. They also took part in the lobby

⁴ These different stages of integration will be further elaborated in the “7. Results and Analysis” chapter

⁵ The set of questions have been added to the appendix

efforts of the UCLG for SDG Goal 11 (Interview VNG 2020). Here, I spoke to their project manager working on the integration of the SDGs in Dutch municipalities.

In Sweden, I interviewed representatives of three municipalities, as well as one overarching organisation. Göteborgsregionen (GR) is a member organisation, overseeing thirteen municipalities on the West Coast of Sweden and has approximately one million inhabitants. It includes the second biggest city of Sweden, Göteborg (Göteborgsregionen n.d.). They can be compared with the Dutch VNG but are more regionally focussed. Within Göteborgsregionen, I interviewed the region planner working with the SDGs in their organisation as well as in their member municipalities. The Swedish municipalities, and members of GR, Göteborgs Stad, Ale and Härryda participated. Göteborg Stad has over 570.000 residents (Göteborgs Stad n.d.). The city took part in a study about the localisation of the SDGs executed by Mistra Urban Future (Valencia 2019). They have also been declared the “world’s most sustainable destination according to the Global Destination Sustainability Index” for four years in a row (Goteborg n.d.) and are, therefore, valuable in this research. Here, I spoke with the planning leader of the Department of Climate and Environment and member of the SDGs workgroup. The municipality of Ale includes 30.926 inhabitants (Ale 2019) and has been a frontrunner in the integration of the SDGs. They worked together with John Holmberg, professor at Chalmers University and advisor during the construction of the SDGs (Chalmers 2018), in their new project ‘Ale 360 degrees’. Ale has been approached for knowledge-exchange on their localisation process by other Swedish municipalities (Interview Ale 2020). The municipality of Ale was represented by the development officer which also supports Ale’s representative of SDG 3. Lastly, Härryda has around 38.000 residents (Härryda Kommun 2019) and they have started to take an holistic view on the SDGs and are looking to increase a dialogue between and with politicians and society (Interview Härryda 2020). Here, I interviewed the official responsible for combining all three aspects of SD within the framework of the SDGs in the municipality.

6.2 Text Analysis

The Qualitative Text Analysis Design (QTAD) is used as the general method of analysis in this study. The decision to apply the QTAD method was made due to its systematic nature by “formulating and exploring classificatory” while creating an analysis that is based on the “interpretation of the relationships between the defined categories” (Mackensen and Wille 1999, 139). The QTAD process includes the reading of texts, appointing codes to define the text, and establishing themes contributing to the research aim. QTAD allowed me to link the

several primary sources with each other and connect those to the literature review (Guetterman, et al. 2018). The purpose was to evaluate the wider meaning behind the text rather than solely focussing on words. While doing so, it is important to note that QTAD is selective due to its observational nature in which the researcher constantly revises his decisions. I have coded my primary sources according to the QTAD steps, provided by Kuckartz (2013), to “link the data back to the research questions and the propositions” (Atkinson 2002, 2). Overall, I established 28 codes, such as ‘global vs local responsibilities’, ‘integration process’, ‘interdependencies’, ‘monitoring’, etc. While coding, I revised the categories and reduced them to twenty during the analysis. I used the qualitative coding programme Nvivo throughout the process.

6.3 Ethical considerations

Although my overall ethical considerations were limited, they had to be considered. I did not necessarily have ethical issues regarding my background (Northern European) and the area I researched (Northern Europe). I was able to approach my interviewees through the help by my contacts within the municipalities. Conducting interviews led to my main ethical consideration. I had to ask the interviewees for permission to record, transcribe and use the information provided (Bryman 2016). Before heading into an interview, it was helpful to keep the hierarchical structure within the interview in mind. I interviewed elites that had more knowledge and status than I. However, similar to Smith (2005), I did not experience any misuse of power and was always approached openly and in a friendly manner. Besides this, language issues had to be kept in mind. In the Netherlands, I was able to conduct the interviews in Dutch. In Sweden, the interviews were held in English, which sometimes caused a search for words but mostly went smoothly. I did have to be careful during the translation of quotes from my Dutch interviews into English. Since QTAD is based on interpretations, I had to be cautious when analysing the interviews and stay close to the statements made by the interviewees. Overall, I had to be aware of generalisation as pointed out by Zainal (2007) and Gerring (2004). The cases portrayed in my research can be used as examples for other local governments and regions who are in the process of localising and monitoring the SDGs. Yet, they are also quite specific to Northern Europe and a limited amount of municipalities.

7. Results and Analysis

Before exploring the municipal interpretations of the SDGs, it is important to note that the governmental structures in the Netherlands and Sweden are similar yet slightly different. Both countries share a similar governmental structure within their countries. Municipalities in both countries represent smaller areas within their provinces/regions. They also depend on reoccurring elections every four years whose results can influence the municipal political position towards the adoption of the SDGs. Minor differences are perceived in the way of organising municipal strategies. These differences are not only specific to the countries but also exist within them. Including their common flexibility to interpret the goals, the integration of the SDGs is executed differently in each municipality. This reflects the statement made by Czarniaswka (2002) regarding the personalisation of global goals on a local level due to their local preference.

It appeared from the interviews that the participating municipalities and overarching organisations have all incorporated and communicated the SDGs in an individual way and are currently at different stages of integration. However, their stages of integration can be identified using the framework for localising the SDGs as introduced by Revi, et al. (2016): 1) planning and implementing the SDGs, and; 2) monitoring. Accordingly, this chapter will be divided into two parts. This will create a structure which helps to answer the main question of how the global responsibility within the SDGs is expressed on a local level in Sweden and the Netherlands. The first part will analyse the first sub question of what factors influence the operationalisation of the SDGs on the local level. By exploring the different driving forces, translation process of the goals, short/long term contradictions and local-global interlinkages, this part will reflect the process of glocalisation while connecting it to global responsibility. The second part looks at how the challenge of monitoring the SDGs is indicative of the continuous reciprocal global-local relationship and whether this affects global responsibility.

Before being able to understand their different interpretations, it is necessary to understand the different stages of integration of each organisation. The various steps taken and current stage of integration of each organisation will be elaborated on below and lead into the analysis. Besides this, it is important to note that the results are merged in the analysis through the presentation of quotes and summaries.

Municipality of Leeuwarden (the Netherlands)

The municipality of Leeuwarden integrated the SDGs into their municipal strategy after their elections in 2018. Each chapter within the strategy has been connected to a SDG. In total, all goals, except for SDGs 3, 5, 14, 16, and 17, have been mentioned in their local strategy (Gemeente Leeuwarden 2018). One year after the creation of this agreement, Leeuwarden became a Global Goals Municipality on September 25, 2019, which is a project by the VNG in the Netherlands. They have transformed this day into a ‘Flagday’ (Vlaggendag) where the SDG flag is raised. On this day, six small businesses that work with the SDGs have been honoured. Leeuwarden strongly focuses on including their citizens in the execution of the SDGs, and considers it as their municipal task to connect people and businesses. They are currently also looking into monitoring (Interview Leeuwarden 2020; Gemeente Leeuwarden 2019).

Municipality of Súdwest-Fryslân (the Netherlands)

The Dutch municipality of Súdwest-Fryslân is currently in the first phase of implementing the SDGs identified by Revi, et al. (2016). Various departments have simultaneously familiarised themselves with the goals, but they officially kicked off their work in September 2019. An infographic was created to illustrate the tasks of the municipality while matching them with the SDGs. It includes an overview of the interconnectedness between national, regional and global responsibilities and shows financial opportunities. At the same time, an internal survey was conducted which asked staff members and management to link the SDGs to their municipality according to people, planet and prosperity aspects (Interview SWF 2020). Furthermore, they have connected the SDGs to their Environment and Planning Act and created a ‘compass for the neighbourhood’ (BRO 2020). Finally, they have linked SDGs 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 17 to their own goals in the budget for 2020. (Interview SWF 2020; Gemeente Súdwest-Fryslân 2019).

Vereniging voor Nederlandse Gemeenten (the Netherlands)

The VNG is an overarching organisation supporting their Dutch member municipalities. They have created a campaign team involved with the SDGs. Previously, this team was dedicated to the MDGs and changed into its current SDG team in 2016. The team noticed that during the MDG period, approximately 196 municipalities (out of 365) had joined the campaign. Whereas currently, only 88 municipalities have become a global goals municipality. The Global Goals team has created a guide for their municipalities in which the goals and sub-goals are connected to the tasks of the municipality, including ideas for their strategy and activities. They also organise projects and conferences about the SDGs (Interview VNG 2020).

Municipality of Ale (Sweden)

The Municipality of Ale had already worked on the different dimensions of sustainability before the SDGs were published. In 2016/2017, they started to translate the SDGs into their local strategy. This included the SDG indicators and described their municipal challenges. From this strategy, the politicians prioritised Goal 3, 4, 8, 11, 13 and 17 in their budget. Furthermore, the municipality of Ale has created a project “Ale 360 degrees” in 2017/2018, in which the input of citizens, organisations and other actors within the municipality is examined. As the project evolved, less attention has been given to the SDGs particularly, but more to the general municipal challenges, and complex issues. These challenges and issues, however, do often relate to the SDGs. This form of dialogue is perceived as a new way of governing by the development officer. Currently, the politicians have decided to work with ‘human interactions’ as a result from the ‘Ale 360 degrees’ survey (Interview Ale 2020). This project indirectly responds to the first defined governance challenge by Bowen, et al. (2017) by integrating various actors and provide opportunities for collective action. Overall, Ale works with the key words transformation, integration, and universality regarding the SDGs (Interview Ale 2020).

Göteborg Stad (Sweden)

Similar to Ale, Göteborg Stad has a strong focus on sustainable development in their strategies (Interview Göteborg Stad 2020). In contrast to Ale, they have not yet integrated the SDGs or pinpointed the SDGs in their strategies. However, the city has framed the SDGs and selected one hundred targets that are relevant to them. These indicators have been broadly interpreted. The selected indicators are viewed as an informational guideline for the city. Currently, they are working on the climate and environmental programme that will include or align with the SDGs. Furthermore, they are communicating the SDGs within their organisation through their guideline but have no plans of communicating their SDG actions to their citizens. In addition, Göteborg Stad has taken part in the comparative research by Mistra Urban Future regarding the localisation of the SDGs as part of their familiarisation (Interview Göteborg Stad 2020; Valencia 2019).

Municipality of Härryda (Sweden)

The municipality of Härryda first started strategically working with the SDGs after a political assignment was given in 2017. In the following year, the municipality structured the SDGs and eventually adopted SDGs 3 and 11 into their budget in June 2019. Due to pressure from the opposition, a new political assignment was given to rewrite the strategic plan regarding the SDGs. The updated strategic plan has taken a holistic view on the SDGs and does not

concentrate on particular goals anymore. This new strategic plan consists of four prioritised themes: fossil free municipality 2030, mental health, strengthening biodiversity, and increasing influence of youth. With these themes and holistic understanding, it is recognised that the SDGs are interconnected and cannot be resolved individually (Interview Härryda 2020).

Göteborgsregionen (Sweden)

Göteborgsregionen is a Swedish overarching consensus-based organisation, supporting 13 municipalities within Västra Götland Regionen. GR has translated the SDGs into their organisational strategy. The strategic document outlines six main challenges that the organisation has to work on and pinpoints those areas where the member municipalities can make a difference by collaborating. The following goals have been integrated in their organisational strategy: Goal 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, and 16 (Göteborgsregionen 2020). The organisation, however, does not have the mandate to form networks/forums for the municipalities to work with the SDGs since not all municipalities within the region have started working with them and the organisation relies on consensus-based decision making (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020).

The brief introduction of the current stage of SDG integration and actions will guide the following analysis to answer the main question of the thesis.

7.1 Stage One: Planning and Integrating the Sustainable Development Goals into Local Strategies

The process towards sustainable development already started before the SDGs were ratified with the creation of different universal agreements and organised conferences (United Nations 2020) as elaborated in the background section. The participating municipalities and overarching organisations affirmed that the SDGs are not necessarily transformative and did not consider them to be a main push regarding SD. All organisations have already worked with sustainability before and express that with the introduction of the SDGs “business will go on as usual” (Interview Göteborg Stad 2020; Interview Härryda 2020). “This [Agenda2030] is sort of the core of the municipality” (Interview Ale 2020). The municipal tasks, responsibilities and basis values already align with the SDGs. Thus, Dutch municipalities question the need to label their daily tasks with the SDGs and become a ‘global goals’ municipality. This is one of the reasons why Dutch municipalities have been hesitant to adopt the SDGs (Interview VNG 2020). Yet, all interviewees agree that the SDGs create an opportunity to have a “shared language” (Interview SWF 2020) around sustainability. It encourages municipalities to communicate their

work and efforts around sustainability, together with the SDGs, towards their citizens and the public sector. “The SDGs is just to strengthen an ongoing process [in sustainability]” (Interview Göteborg Stad 2020) and help prioritising. The SDGs are a “fantastic foundation for building cross-sectoral collaboration [and] cross-department collaboration” (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020). The goals are recognised to be a good communication tool as well as a guideline for strategic actions for the different organisations. Its joint language stimulates cooperation between different actors throughout society and the private sector to move to a common sustainability (Interview Göteborg Stad 2020).

The overall communication of the integration of the SDGs within different departments and outside of the organisation is still perceived to be a challenge. Most municipalities already work directly or indirectly with sustainable development. This involvement in sustainable development by municipalities leads to the assumption that the localisation process of the SDGs should be smooth. However, it is observed that each individual organisation has responded and acted differently to the integration of the SDGs, which aligns with the concept of glocalisation. Therefore, this chapter will look at the sub-question: “*What factors influence the operationalisation of the SDGs on the local level?*” This question will help us to answer the overarching main research question. It will explore an in-depth analysis on the different aspects of localisation experienced by municipalities such as driving forces, local-global relationship, short-long term contradictions, etc. These empirical experiences will be linked with the concept of glocalisation, academic criticism of the SDGs, and global responsibility. This part contributes with a reflection of the expression of global responsibility within the SDGs. It will also illustrate certain discrepancies between the predicted difficulties and empirical analysis.

7.1.1 Interdependence between goals, departments and sectors

The SDGs are interdependent and interlinked with each other and, thus, require the inclusion of as well as action by different departments and sectors. “The goals are connected” (Interview Ale 2020) and it would be “counterproductive [to] choose to focus on two goals instead of [...] the whole picture” (Interview HARRYDA 2020). These statements confirm the observation by Mair, et al. (2017) and Stafford-Smith, et al. (2017). Inclusion of various actors will lead to transformational change (Steiner 2017) and relates to the definition of global responsibility in which different actors share responsibility (Voegtlin and Scherer 2015). The SDGs should be reviewed in the search for “connections between goals and [...] contradict[ions], or where some solutions can help other goals” (Interview Ale 2020) during the translation period. This helps to limit counterproductive actions instead of restricting integration to single goals. A critical

engagement contributes to a possibly successful integration. The freedom of interpretation has led to different methods used by municipalities. This illustrates that the various interpretations have led to actions and priorities to improve sustainable development, which demonstrates global responsibility.

The municipalities emphasise the need for interaction between and inclusion of different departments within the integration of the SDGs. Currently, mainly the environmental departments of the municipalities and organisations have taken the initiative to take action or have pushed for integration. The VNG recognises that their contacts regarding the SDGs among the Dutch municipalities are mostly from the environmental and/or international relations department. They hope to see an increase of involvement among social departments “since the goals are very social and inclusive” (Interview VNG 2020). This is also reflected in Göteborgsregionen. Here, the environmental department pushed for integration of the SDGs but “it is not like we [the environmental department] had to drag the other departments into it” (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020). To increase cross-departmental involvement, Härryda, Ale and Göteborg Stad all have created a workgroup or assigned officials from different departments to particular goals to actively discuss the SDGs and increase its mandate (Interview Ale 2020; Interview Göteborg Stad 2020; Interview Härryda 2020). The workgroup in Härryda, for example, contains “officials from different departments [...to] address complex issues where one department cannot solve it on their own” (Interview Härryda 2020). Leeuwarden and SWF have organised a workshop and a kick-off day to raise internal awareness to gradually get other departments on board (Interview Leeuwarden 2020; Interview SWF 2020). The various departments are not only necessary for an active integration of the SDGs but also for its monitoring⁶. These empirical findings align with global responsibility. The call for localisation requires the inclusion of various different departments within the organisations, as well as other actors, to successfully integrate the SDGs and avoid conflicts (Voegtlin and Scherer 2015; Stafford-Smith, et al. 2017).

Besides internal awareness, a successful integration of the SDGs requires external awareness, which is also highlighted by the Roadmap by Global Taskforce, UN Habitat, UNDP (n.d.). By communicating them externally, the integration of the SDGs becomes recognised. Each municipality has executed and prioritised the SDGs, and its external communication, differently. The Dutch municipalities have communicated their choice of goals in their

⁶ Monitoring will be elaborated in: 7.2– Stage Two: Monitoring of [local] Indicators

municipal strategies (Interview SWF 2020; Interview Leeuwarden 2020), whereas the Swedish municipalities have only mentioned the overall aim of including the goals (Interview Ale 2020; Interview Härryda; Interview Göteborg Stad 2020). Another way of increasing awareness is through education/academia or contacting the private sector. For example, Leeuwarden is including university students in projects and internships regarding the SDGs since the city hosts a university department dedicated to sustainability and global responsibility (Interview Leeuwarden 2020). Göteborg Stad has participated in a comparable study by Valencia (2019) on the localisation of the SDGs. Göteborgsregionen, on the other hand, has a partnership with different universities and businesses within their region, which are mostly already aware of the SDGs (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020). Härryda aims to “have dialogues together with officials, politicians, companies, local companies, different local organisation, [and] especially with youth as well” (Interview Härryda 2020) since it is part of their key aims. Härryda wishes to increase the dialogue with the general society but does admit that “it is easier to address organisations [and businesses] in which the public [is] organised” (Interview Härryda 2020). Ideally, the private sector and society would pursue the goals without the pressure of the municipality (Interview SWF 2020). The municipality should “try to increase awareness without obligations. [...] You should not create [a] negative connotation with the global goals and tire people whenever they hear the word” (Interview Leeuwarden 2020). Generally, the municipal task is considered to spread awareness, connect and trigger the society to work with the SDGs rather than exerting pressure. Therefore, the municipality of Leeuwarden has organised a ‘Flagday’ [Vlaggendag] to honour local entrepreneurs that have worked with the SDGs (Interview Leeuwarden 2020). The municipality of Ale has created the “Ale 360 Degrees” [Ale i 360°] project to include their citizens. Here, the goal is to “formulate, test, and solve problems together with residents and organisations in the municipality” (Interview Ale 2020). The project does not necessarily purely focus on the SDGs, but discusses issues that are related to the Agenda2030. It is part of a new trust-based governing, which encourages strong dialogue between the different actors within the municipality (Ibid).

Within the focus of awareness, the local is solely perceived as a place defined by Roudometof (2019). Municipalities are connected to their inhabitants and local businesses and, therefore, necessary for the global to be recognised. Currently, each municipality is working on external awareness independently. Together with other institutions, local, national, and regional, their strength could increase. By creating global consciousness among civilians and organisations, I would argue that the place of belonging would lead into a global space while being influenced

by the local. This emerges global responsibility on a local level through the creation of ownership by increasing awareness and positively influence SDG implementation.

7.1.2 Global versus Local

The discussion around glocalisation leads to a better understanding of the interconnections and correlations between the local and the global in glocal processes. The SDGs showcase the reciprocal relationship between the global and the local where the local is recognised and incorporated by the global. The global SDG participatory processes have included the local and continue to allow local authorities to interpret the goals independently after its ratification. The empirical question here is how the local has dealt with the global pressures that the goals represent. Understanding how the driving forces, the translation of the goals, and the interlinkages of the global and local shape the process of glocalisation can be used to explore its connection with global responsibility. Overall, the glocal processes show the complementing as well as competing aspects within the search for influence as portrayed by Roudometof (2016), which will be empirically elaborated below.

Driving forces

Different driving forces triggered the municipalities to start familiarising themselves with and integrating the SDGs. None of the participants named one particular driving force of integration and various forces collide with each other. Even though the SDGs are primarily focussed on a top-down process (Weitz, et al. 2014), some municipalities experienced an internal bottom-up force whereas others faced a top-down approach. In addition, external influence from society (Interview SWF 2020), “local enterprises” (Interview Härryda 2020) and “funding bodies” (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020) have been an important push for municipalities to adopt the SDGs. Another reason is related to certain political fashion, which aligns with Czarniawska (2002). Through the exchange of experience and knowledge, municipalities/politicians are inspired by each other to use the SDGs for their sustainable development strategy (Interview VNG 2020). The SDGs are a non-binding initiative and, therefore, require dedicated politicians and staff members to push action forward. “Especially if they have a good dialogue and relationship, then things happen” (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020).

It should be noted that the top-down and bottom-up forces within the municipalities are often intertwined. Yet, the basics of the different forces are important in the development and creation of the SDG integration mandate. A difference can be seen between Göteborg Stad and Ale. Both municipalities already actively worked with SD before the SDGs were signed in 2016. Therefore, they both immediately recognised the importance of including the SDGs. “It was

quite clear from the start that this [the SDGs] was going to be an important agenda for the world” (Interview Göteborg Stad 2020). Whereas the municipality of Ale actively started to translate the SDGs in their local strategy through a top-down push from the head of the organisation (Interview Ale 2020), Göteborg Stad faced a bottom-up force to work with the SDGs within their organisation. The need for a mandate to work with the SDGs in Göteborg Stad was pushed by officials working with sustainability. The participation in the Mistra Urban Future Research also influenced their familiarisation (Interview Göteborg Stad 2020). Currently, however, both municipalities are in different implementation stages. Ale has connected the SDGs to their strategy and are currently working with a new governance project (Interview Ale 2020), while Göteborg Stad is still working on integrating the SDGs. Even though the city is continuously working on SD itself, a political assignment has not been given to use the SDGs as part of “Gothenburg’s steering model” (Interview Göteborg Stad 2020). The municipality of Härryda also experienced somewhat of a bottom-up approach. After politicians of the municipality had decided to retreat from being a Fairtrade municipality, an official brought up the SDGs. The new “holistic view, that you can also have [an] economic perspective on SD, [...] was appealing [for politicians]” (Interview Härryda 2020) and led to the political majority agreeing on the importance of the SDGs and assignments were given. However, questions arise “if they [the politicians] really understood the complexity and the range of goals” (Interview Härryda 2020). The role of the political orientation is also reflected in the driving force within the municipality of Leeuwarden. The progressive majority in the municipality of Leeuwarden and “a slowly growing political trend (Interview Leeuwarden 2020)” influenced their adoption of the SDGs. The integration of the SDGs in the municipality of SWF has also been pushed by the progressive majority as well as their mayor. “We became a global goals municipality [...] before we had connected a meaning to it” (Interview SWF 2020), which stimulated their actions on localising the SDGs. Even though both bottom-up and top-down driving forces both led to action around the SDGs, it seems from the empirical data that a top-down force leads to a stronger mandate towards and integration of the SDGs. Especially since municipalities do rely on political assignments.

External influence is likewise considered to be a driving force towards wider SDGs integration. Through awareness among citizens, businesses and particular funds, municipalities are more stimulated to adopt the SDGs. For example, while internal SDG developments and familiarisation had started in SWF, “we got tipped [...] by an involved citizen about a [SDG workgroup] at the VNG” (Interview SWF 2020) during an external consultation. Within

Härryda, it is acknowledged that local, as well as national, businesses can pressure the municipality for deeper integration “since we are really [an] enterprise friendly municipality” (Interview Härryda 2020). Göteborgsregionen, as well as Göteborg Stad, identified the need for funding as an external driving force. Several national and EU funds now require the suggested projects to be connected to the SDGs. This encourages municipalities to actively think about and link the SDGs to their projects and applications (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020; Interview Göteborg Stad 2020). Overall, I would argue that stronger integration of the SDGs requires various concurrent driving forces on a local level. It creates ownership of global goals among different actors. This process reflects ‘glocality’, as defined by Brenner (2013), where local citizenship has recognised as ‘global belonging’ and stimulates the adherence to global responsibility.

Translation of Goals

The need for localisation of the SDGs has been expressed since their ratification in 2016 (Slack 2015). The SDGs rely on the integration by different (governmental) levels due to their non-binding nature (Galli, et al. 2018). At the same time, localisation automatically leads to unique translation and interpretation of the global goals in each organisation. The goals are personalised and modified to the local situation and preference (Czarniawska 2002). Local translation is also necessary since it otherwise “is just words and [will not] mean anything for people in their daily work” (Interview Ale 2020). It needs to become relatable, understandable, and, most importantly, relevant to the organisation. Local translation will help fulfil the four incentives, coined by Revi, et al. (2016), connected with the SDGs, such as leaving no one and no place behind. Localisation and translation of the SDGs gives the opportunity to include local practices and principles. This inclusion reflects the validity of glocalisation argued by Khondker (2005). The translation process has been criticised by Stafford-Smith, et al. (2017) since difficulties might appear due to their complex and global nature. Yet, this process gives the opportunity for municipalities to reflect on their SD policies and global responsibility.

Even though the global goals are criticised to be too broad and complex, most of the organisations have not faced many difficulties with translating the goals into their local context. On the contrary, the indicators have made the goals quite specific, which makes it easier to implement them within local strategies. “It was sometimes more a conflict between specificity in the targets and the broadness in our documents” (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020) and an open mind-set allows the creation of relationships between the goals and own strategies. Several means of strategies and support systems have been activated. Municipalities have used

accessible national and international guides regarding the localisation of the SDGs to support their understanding of the link between their municipal tasks and the SDGs indicators. Besides this, they have exchanged knowledge on the integration of the SDGs with other municipalities or organisations, which reflects the call for partnerships by Steiner (2017). For example, the Dutch municipalities worked with guides from and knowledge of the VNG as well as the UN and have participated in workgroups among several municipalities organised by the VNG (Interview SWF 2020; Interview Leeuwarden 2020). The VNG themselves take part in the “UCLG Capacity and Institution Building workgroup” as a secretariat and in the “European association for municipalities”, where they joined projects with “Italian, Latvian and Spanish overarching municipal organisation [...] to create national dialogues around the SDGs” (Interview VNG 2020). In Sweden, the municipalities individually exchanged amongst each other, through forums and the Swedish department of the UN (Interview Ale 2020; Interview Göteborg Stad 2020; Interview Härryda 2020). These partnerships are considered valuable. Yet, as Interview Ale (2020) expresses,

“You can’t really copy another municipality’s work [a] 100%, because you have to go through the process yourself. You have to [give] a meaning to the goals on your local level and in your municipality, because otherwise it will only be a communication project. It will only be these colourful boxes that we work with the same way as we have been doing [with] other sustainability challenges in the past”.

The translation process is an important step for the municipality to get an understanding of the SDGs, how they are linked to their own work, and how they can become an asset to their municipal strategy rather than ‘just’ a labelling tool.

The risk of cherry-picking the SDGs, as mentioned by Stafford-Smith, et al. (2017), is not unfounded. Municipalities need to be aware that translation or labelling of the goals alone does not automatically lead to action and implementation, but further requires a specific method or strategy. It is advised by Valencia (2019) “to not take the SDGs as gospel but also engage critically with them as well” (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020). For example, municipalities in Göteborgsregionen discovered gaps and missed a direct focus on the rights for queer people or the role of culture within sustainability. Another issue appeared with Goal 17, which focusses on global partnership (United Nations n.d.b). “If you are a really small municipality, maybe helping other cities on a global stage is not your main priority” (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020). Yet, municipalities can and have integrated Goal 17. “We [municipalities] do not have to focus on the global aspect but we can still keep the whole partnership aspect [and] achieve

partnerships within [...] our region” (Ibid). Therefore, local translation of the global goals is required.

Sustainable Development Goal 11

In general, glocalisation leads to two processes, as outlined by Khondker (2005). Namely, micro-globalisation and macro-localisation. Micro-globalisation has been reflected by the translation of the global goals into a local level. Macro-localisation, on the other hand, was played out during the establishment of the SDGs. The local was recognised to be essential to the global through the consultation process. The inclusion of local ideas and preferences on a global level resulted in Goal 11, to “make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable” (United Nations 2017). Therefore, it could be assumed that most local governments mainly focus on Goal 11 in their integration process. “I have heard people calling Goal 11 the local goal [...but] I think all of them are local goals and there is a tendency for municipal actors to only focus on goal 11” (Göteborgsregionen 2020). Yet, many SDGs are connected with municipal tasks and should thus be integrated as well. Some local authorities even decided not to include Goal 11 and focus on other goals instead. VNG recognises that most municipalities in the Netherlands do not solely focus on Goal 11 since many of its indicators also align with other SDG goals and targets. “Goal 11 is primarily important for the national and international level. The national governments have to continuously be reminded that they are not the only actor and that municipalities and cities have a very important role as well” (Interview VNG 2020). SDG 11 demonstrates in the empirical findings and the literature review that macro-localisation has been valuable due its recognition of the local on the global level, which led to the creation of this particular goal. However, I would argue that micro-globalisation processes should not be limited to the outcomes of macro-localisation. The inclusion of several goals, besides Goal 11, is necessary to improve sustainable development and contribute to global responsibility.

Global and local interlinkages

Brenner (2003) describes glocalisation as a state strategy where spatial restructuring occurs to improve local and global relationships. Within this strategy, there will be global and local tensions and global input will be customised. The reciprocal relationship between the global and local, described by Kraidy (2003), is apparent in this state strategy. Yet, the question arises of how the local authorities perceive their global responsibility within the goals and how this glocal state strategy has influenced their perceptions, consciously or unconsciously. It would be wishful thinking to expect local adoption and restructuring of local policies according to

global goals, rather than matching global goals to existing local strategies. Most municipalities, however, admit that they have first looked upon their local priorities and have then added the SDGs to it. Stafford-Smith, et al. (2017) consider this as cherry-picking but I would argue that this wording has a negative connotation to it. For some, “it was a little bit reflecting and using it [the SDGs] as a tool to identify gaps in our priorities” (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020). Some municipalities have revised their strategies with the SDGs or used their strengths. Yet, it remains important to also include SDGs that might be challenging to the municipality.

It is difficult for municipalities to strike a balance between adopting all goals and not producing results or integrating a particular amount of goals to get the most effective and successful progress. Therefore, the municipalities have taken different approaches. The municipality of Leeuwarden has “looked at how they can contribute [to the SDGs] according to their strength” (Interview Leeuwarden 2020), which is, for example, water technology. They have pointed the appropriate goals to their strategy (Gemeente Leeuwarden 2018). SWF is currently still debating on whether they should focus on a few goals or have a more general integration of the SDGs. “We have stated that we want to contribute to the global and national goals, not only to the local, provincial, and regional level. We want to have a holistic approach [towards the goals]” (Interview SWF 2020). This approach has also been used by the municipality of Härryda to allow for interpretation of the interconnectedness between the goals. They have compared their local goals and indicators with those of the national level but have not considered their personal global contribution (Interview Härryda 2020). Within Göteborgsregionen, it is recognised that some of their Swedish municipalities do have the “ambition to take on a global responsibility based on their actual size and relevance” (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020). Even though the ambition towards global responsibility is apparent, the participating municipalities do admit that adoption and integration of the SDGs will remain rather focussed on local actions and effects. For example, the municipality of Ale has included universality as part of their text analysis of the SDGs and recognised that local actions affect the global sphere. However, it is difficult for a municipality to communicate with a global perspective towards their politicians. “It works when you talk about it [the SDGs...] but not when you want to find the right solutions to something or show what direction you want to go towards. Then the global level is too abstract” (Interview Ale 2020). It is always easier to connect, work and relate with local influences and approaches, which is also emphasised by the VNG. “They [the municipalities] are bound to the priorities that they have already defined. There is a limited leeway on what to prioritise” (Interview VNG 2020). Göteborg Stad, on the

other hand, has not looked at the local vs global aspirational interlinkages yet and has used the SDGs to identify gaps within their existing SD strategy (Interview Göteborg Stad 2020).

I would argue that the main focus on local strengths and aspirations is not necessarily negative. It still leads to interpretation and consideration of the SDGs in a local strategy. Unconsciously, the global influences the local state strategy. For instance, Göteborgsregionen has looked at suitable SDGs for their local strategy by conducting a text analysis. Similar to Göteborg Stad, this method led to the SDGs showing gaps and strengths of the organisation. Overall, organisations have recognised the SDGs as good guidelines since they can stimulate local action on global issues. This recognition shows the global-local relationship and state strategy, defined by Brenner (2003), and creates an unconscious glocal process. The local is not only working with the local modified global goals, but it also is stimulated to cooperate outside their municipal borders. Global responsibility is, therefore, activated.

7.1.3 Short versus Long Term Aims

In general, there is an academic discussion around the short- and long-term frictions within the operationalisation of the SDGs (Stafford-Smith, et al. 2017; Stuart and Woodroffe 2016). The SDGs were established with a long-term SD perspective, but the local structures are usually mainly short term oriented due to elections and yearly budgets. These structural and political variables influence decision-making but do not change the long-term aim of the municipalities towards the SDGs. All participants recognised the necessity of a long-term perspective to resolve the issues of the SDGs until 2030 and beyond. However, it remains challenging to translate the aim into a consistent long-term policy and committing global responsibility.

Structural Influence

The municipal organisation structure slightly differs among the municipalities within the Netherlands and Sweden and are, therefore, compared individually. However, all municipalities do rely and include a (four year) municipal strategy as well as an annual budget report and can, hence, be compared. Some of the municipalities are aware of certain inconsistencies or weaknesses in their strategy structures and are currently restructuring. Göteborg Stad, for example, works with three kinds of strategies. 1) Long-term programmes, which are around ten years. These programmes contain goals and strategies that are currently set up until 2030; 2) short-term plans, which are three to four years detached from the election cycle, and; 3) budgets, which are annually. They are currently merging their various long-term programmes to create an overview. Göteborg Stad is “thinking about using the SDGs as a reference, when [they] go through [their new] document” (Interview Göteborg Stad 2020). The municipality of Härryda,

on the other hand, is working on transforming their yearly strategic plan around sustainable development into a fifteen year plan. This plan will be used as a framework for their policies and due in 2035. HÄrryda also aims to get the SDG strategy integrated in their municipal strategy made by their politicians. These are separate strategies at the moment. There is a need for a strong dialogue between the politicians and the officials to make the long-term strategic plan work. “The [biggest] challenge that we have here, I think, is the relationship between the politicians, or elected, and officials. We really need to work together. [...] If we are going to do this in the long term, we need to have [the politicians] on board” (Interview HÄrryda 2020). Besides the varying strategic plans, the yearly budgets can also lead to contradictions between the long-term aim of the SDGs, the general sustainable development, and short-term plans. The municipalities are all aware of these possible conflicts, but recognise that they cannot change the structure. “In reality, unfortunately, the short-term budget could be [...] not in line with the long-term. In theory it should not, but in the real world it could” (Interview Göteborgs Stad 2020).

However, overall, the conflict between short- and long-term perspectives might not be severe since the issue described in the SDGs will not disappear in the near future (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020). The SDGs require a long-term approach to create a sustainable future. Their importance will, hopefully, let them reappear in the yearly budget reports and short-term strategic plans. On the other hand, there is not much time left to act. “It is 2030 to ideally have solved all of the goals, not 2030 to start working on them” (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020).

Political Influence

Whereas the structure of the municipalities is set, the political orientation is fluid and strongly influences the structural strategies. All municipalities within Sweden and the Netherlands have reoccurring elections every four years. Each of these elections creates the possibility for change in the political orientation. A newly elected majority or coalition can lead to a different attitude towards salient issues and the perceived necessity of integrating the SDGs. It can either be positive and lead to deeper integration as well as more action, or negative and ignorance. However, in general, a change of political majority will not necessarily lead to the neglect of the SDGs since “no one is rooting for hunger” (Interview Leeuwarden 2020). Yet, a political shift could lead to a change of focus towards the SDGs in the municipal strategies for their upcoming term. Especially since the SDGs are political in nature.

The need for political mandate makes the long-term integration of the SDGs vulnerable. Especially since long-term goals do not immediately show results. Politicians, or their party, usually aim to be re-elected and are, therefore, dependent on their voters (Interview Ale 2020). To be able to get voters on board, politicians want to demonstrate their successes, which is mostly possible with short-term goals. This might create conflicts with the long-term nature of the SDGs. In addition, the integration of the SDGs opens up the interlinkages between sectors. “It becomes visible if we score well on the introduction of solar panels, economic profits are possible. However, it will have negative effects on agriculture, biodiversity, well-being, etc.” (Interview SWF 2020). This conflict is something that politicians do not necessarily favour. Therefore, a balance needs to be found between the short-term strategic plans and long-term goals. I would argue that the empirical results show that a different manner of reporting progress results of the SDGs to politicians might help to stimulate them to pursue global responsibility. It will help the communication to their voters while stimulating the integration of the long-term SDGs. The discussion around monitoring will be elaborated in the following part.

7.2 Stage Two: Monitoring of [local] Indicators

Monitoring is considered to be an important tool and step in the process of localising and integrating the SDGs. Monitoring will grant an insight in the process of integration and would also “ensure that we leave no one behind” (Revi, et al. 2016, 16). Therefore, monitoring has been mentioned as the fourth step of localising the SDGs in the Roadmap published by Global Taskforce, et al. (n.d.). Monitoring also validates the actions taken by municipalities regarding the SDGs. It will hold municipalities accountable, help them communicate their progress, be transparent, and accountable. Monitoring requires the inclusion of different governance levels. This section will look at the sub-question: “*How does the global-local relationship challenge the monitoring processes of the SDGs?*” by providing empirical examples. It will contribute with an elaboration on the necessity of a flexible monitoring system to identify progress on the SDGs as well as stimulate global responsibility.

Monitoring is something that municipalities face difficulties with on their own. It is challenging to find the right and effective monitoring structure. The representative from municipality of Leeuwarden admits that they have probably not taken the specific monitoring process into account while integrating the SDGs into their local strategies. However, “it is nice to present a plan, but you also have to be hold accountable for it” (Interview Leeuwarden 2020). All municipalities within this empirical study do feel the need to evaluate their progress but express their struggles. There is a demand for finding a monitoring system that is able to show the local

progress, but, at the same time, is comparable with fellow municipalities to make data relevant. It is challenging to narrow the targets down into manageable tracking indicators. “Some of the targets are quite broad and you could imagine needing several different indicators to even understand one target” (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020). Another challenge is translating the outcomes and their impact into terms that are understandable to the organisation (Ibid).

The process towards a national as well as an individual monitoring system reflects the constant need for interaction between global, national, and local institutions within glocalisation as stated by Swyndegouw (2004). National bodies have taken measures to create monitoring systems. In the Netherlands, the VNG is currently running a small workgroup to establish a monitoring system. However, they face difficulties in establishing indicators that contribute to and measure a particular goal. “You will have to create indicators that exactly contribute to a goal, which becomes precision work because how can you exactly measure whether or not you will reach the goal with the taken steps” (Interview VNG 2020). The goals are generally broadly interpreted, but indicators must be specific to evaluate the taken actions and their progress. Depending on their financial resources, the VNG would like to publish a system in 2020 (Interview VNG 2020). Whereas the Netherlands does not have a specific national monitoring system for the SDGs yet, Sweden has created some SDG indicators in Kolada (n.d.). This national monitoring system gives municipalities a basic set of indicators to which the municipalities usually add more to. Another tool that has been used by one municipality, Leeuwarden, is the City Scan⁷ by the Global Compact Cities Programme. This is a global tool that will personalise the indicators relevant to the city in question. The City Scan, however, is an expensive tool and, therefore, requires time and resources, which makes it highly exclusive. The municipality of Leeuwarden has agreed upon providing more of their own statistical input, in collaboration with students, to decrease the overall cost (Interview Leeuwarden 2020). “The standardised monitoring system might not necessarily fit perfectly to the city, but is still quite useful and define a few indicators” (Interview Leeuwarden 2020). Yet, in general, it is difficult for municipalities to use standardised tools. They are considered to be a good basic tool and point of reference to start with, but are often too broadly designed for local authorities and always require additional specified indicators. The representative of the municipality of Leeuwarden argues that global tools become problematic since progress is perceived differently in various parts of the world and could, therefore, lead to misinterpretations of the local reality

⁷ See for more information: Global Compact Cities Programme. n.d. “THE CITY SCAN.” Global Compact Cities Programme. <https://citiesprogramme.org/participate/the-city-scan/>.

(Ibid). To build a national tool, the VNG exchanged knowledge with other European countries. Among the various nation-states within the international working group, “almost every country creates a national monitoring system and they [the EU] start to doubt if they should [financially] support all initiatives. They [the EU] would like to see one system which everyone can use” (Interview VNG 2020). Yet, the nation-states decided on a national approach since “all municipalities within these countries would like that their monitoring is compatible to their own local reality” (Ibid).

Even a national approach experiences criticism. For example, Sweden has published a monitoring system Kolada (n.d.), which has faced disapproval by the participating Swedish municipalities. On the one hand, Kolada “could help us [municipalities]” (Interview Ale 2020), but “if you [are] only going to use the Kolada indicators, it is quite hard to get the whole picture” (Interview Härryda 2020). The national system might be “useful for some people and municipalities, but is less useful for others” (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020). Generally, the participating municipalities have to add their own indicators to Kolada to analyse their local progress. “If you [the municipality] want to monitor, you usually use that indicator set [Kolada] and then add maybe twice as many indicators at least” (Interview Göteborg Stad 2020). Yet, a locally developed monitoring system is not desirable. Even though municipalities share common challenges, “all municipalities also have smaller challenges that are maybe more local based” (Interview Ale 2020). A collaborative local monitoring system would still require a fine-tuning of each individual municipality. The creation of various local monitoring system would also cause an unorganised situation around monitoring and make the progress results less representative. The main challenge of creating a monitoring system is to develop one that is coherent and comparable, which aligns with Reyers et al. (2017). I would argue that it is important to create a system that is nationally or regionally organised, including broader indicators. This will give municipalities the opportunity to add individual indicators and close gaps, but, at the same time, can be used for relevant comparison nationally, regionally, and globally.

Overall, evaluating with statistics through indicators is perceived as challenging (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020). The use of indicators is not only criticised by Mair, et al. (2017), the representative of the municipality of Ale also acknowledges it being problematic. “If we focus on that indicator then the entire work around it, [the progress] could actually go the wrong way if we focus on the wrong indicators. So we want to sort of balance it with more a qualitative way of measuring” (Interview Ale 2020). A strong focus on indicators risks leaving out the

experience of citizens and leads to governance according to numbers only. “Doing [a] big [qualitative] report is one way but that is too time-consuming for us” (Interview Ale 2020). In addition, the frequency of monitoring is questioned. The SDGs are less likely to show short-term progress and statistics might not be available annually due to their long-term nature. “I think [that] we [the municipality of Härryda] are mostly going to monitor this [SDG progress] every four years [...] I hope we could do that right after [each] election” (Interview Härryda 2020) to introduce the newly elected politicians to the new term and help them prioritise. This way, a more extensive report can be created. The municipality of Ale, on the other hand, is shifting to a new ‘trust-based’ governing system to focus less on statistics (Interview Ale 2020). Overall, the empirical results demonstrate the need for a balance between the long-term goals and a non-statistical approach while being able to report to politicians and citizens regularly. Creating an extensive long-term monitoring report annually is too time-consuming, whereas a yearly monitoring report based solely on indicators would be too narrow and would not correctly reflect the progress of integration. Limitations on progress monitoring and communication can negatively influence global responsibility .

8. Concluding Discussion

From the theoretical discussions, it can be concluded that globalisation and glocalisation are entangled concepts but can also be analysed separately. Even though globalisation has led to the creation of global governance and the opportunity to create global goals, such as the Sustainable Development Goals, it is glocalisation that emphasises the inclusion of the local within this dynamic. Glocalisation highlights the governance processes that combine the local and the global and establishes a new area for the glocal. It focuses on the reciprocal relationship between the two dimensions. The recognition of the local is also existent within the SDGs. The UN has included local consultation during the establishment of the goals and dedicated Goal 11 to local authorities (Slack 2015). Local governments are acknowledged to be essential partners and actors by various scholars and the UN when it comes to the execution of the SDGs. They are the institutions closest to the citizens and local businesses. The empirically researched local governments and overarching municipal organisations also recognise the importance of integrating the goals and have decided to translate them into their local strategies. This need of translation leads to heterogeneous interpretations and unique actions, which is a reflection of the glocalisation processes (Czarniawska 2002). These heterogeneous dynamics are similar within the Netherlands and Sweden. Both countries are built on similar political structures and act on the local integration of the SDGs. Yet, each municipality has interpreted the goals differently and developed unique action plans regarding implementation. Whereas Stafford-Smith, et al. (2017) criticise the complexity of the goals and the difficulty to translate them to a local level, the participating municipalities within this study did not confirm this criticism. They have not faced many issues regarding their own translation of the global goals into local policy and some even argued that the goals even were too specific sometimes. Different national and global institutions and organisations have provided localisation guides that local governments could use to familiarise themselves with. Besides this, the local authorities have recognised the importance of the inclusion of their citizens, businesses and education to create ownership throughout society. This reflects the similar academic definition of global responsibility and leads to the main aim of the thesis.

The main question of this research, “*How is global responsibility within the Sustainable Development Goals expressed on a local level in Sweden and the Netherlands?*” is addressed by an analysis of the driving forces, global-local interlinkages, short-long term aims and the translation of the goals within municipalities. The empirical focus contributes to the academic discussion surrounding the SDGs while connecting them with global responsibility. From the

empirical research it can be concluded that the SDGs have not necessarily pushed the participating municipalities in these Western high-income countries to activate their global responsibility by acting upon sustainable development. All local authorities had already started working with SD long before the SDGs were ratified. The SDGs, however, have become a good guideline and communication tool for the municipalities, internally and externally. They incentivise the inclusion of various sectors and departments to work towards sustainable development. Even though the SDGs are created for a wider global context and aim towards long-term global sustainable development, the local authorities admit that they have to stay centred within their space of governance. They integrate the SDGs into their existing local strategies, rather than creating local policies in line with the SDGs. The municipalities depend on political assignments and support, which is sensitive to local progress and action. Actions by the municipalities need to be relatable to their society and become, therefore, locally focussed. This, on the other hand, can also be perceived as a strength. Their local initiatives are inspired by national, regional and global settings and, therefore, reflect the existence of a glocal dynamic and still results in global responsibility and sustainable development. In addition, the representative of Göteborg Stad (2020) emphasises, that analysing the efforts on sustainable development should be separated from the integration process of the SDGs. However, it would be valuable to connect both and increase and improve overlapping efforts.

The execution of sustainable development and the SDGs causes long- and short-term frictions within the municipalities. They all identify the long-term nature of the goals, but do rely on the short-term policies and structures following their political mandates. The empirical data demonstrates that good communication with politicians will help to get continuous inclusion of long-term SDG goals into short-term policies and budgets. Another issue that municipalities come across is the monitoring of the global goals on a local level and the evaluation of their global responsibility. Monitoring is necessary to reflect progress on certain policies which have to be communicated to the global as well as the local level. However, globally or nationally identified indicators in monitoring systems often are not in line with and too narrow for the locally modified goals. On the other hand, relying on only local monitoring systems would lead to a disordered and uncoordinated monitoring and would not be relevant for national or global comparison. The local reliance on a national or global system is again a reflection of the glocalisation concept defined by Swyndegouw (2004), where different levels of governance continuously have to work together and the process moves upwards as well as downwards.

8.1 Further Research

This research has shown the interlinkage between the global and the local in relation to the integration of the Sustainable Development Goals and its contribution to global responsibility. The constant influences and interactions between the local and the global within the SDGs reflects the concept of glocalisation. However, further research is needed to dive into the issue of monitoring which was described by the participants. Monitoring shows another global and local dynamic beyond the integration of the SDGs. Here, the global and national level rely on a comparable review on the progress of the local authorities. The local, on the other hand, relies on the national or global level for a monitoring system that is relevant to their local modified goals. Within this research, it seems that a monitoring system should be organised on a national or regional level to contain broad indicators that can be locally adjusted and yet remain relatable for all levels. Also, this system's frequency should be reconsidered from yearly to bi-annual or even four year periods due to the long-term nature of the goals. Data will not be available yearly and does not provide a good insight in the process if monitored too frequently. However, further research is needed to establish an ideal system that combines the two governance levels and makes a useful system, while recognising the global and local reciprocal relationship and contributing to global responsibility.

Besides this, the world currently faces a pandemic that affects each individual, institutions and businesses. This crisis is expected to lead to an economic recession. [Local] Governments are most likely to respond with various short-term policies to recover economically. The representative of the municipality of Härryda (2020) fairly raised the question on how this economic collapse will affect the transition to sustainable development. Future developments and further research will show whether or not the integration of the SDGs will be put on hold or will become even more important in the road to a sustainable recovery.

9. References

- Adams, Barbara, and Karen Judd. 2016. “2030 Agenda and the SDGs: Indicator Framework, Monitoring and Reporting.”
- Ale. 2019. “Befolkning | Ale.Se.” www.ale.se. 2019. https://ale.se/kommun--politik/om-ale-kommun/ale-kommun-i-siffror/befolkning.html?vv_hit=true.
- Atkinson, John. 2002. “Four Steps to Analyse Data from a Case Study Method.” Australia: Association for Information Systems.
- B. Barber. 2013. *If Mayors Ruled the World. Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1998. “On Glocalization: Or Globalization for Some, Localization for Some Others.” *Thesis Eleven* 54 (1): 37–49.
- Bowen, Kathryn J, Nicholas A Cradock-Henry, Florian Koch, James Patterson, Tina Häyhä, Jess Vogt, and Fabiana Barbi. 2017. “Implementing the ‘Sustainable Development Goals’: Towards Addressing Three Key Governance Challenges—Collective Action, Trade-Offs, and Accountability.” *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 26–27 (June): 90–96.
- Brenner, Neil. 2003. “Chapter 12 - ‘Glocalization’ as a State Spatial Strategy.” In *Remaking the Global Economy: Economic-Geographical Perspectives, 197–215*. London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- BRO. 2020. “Werkversie Omgevingsvisie 1.0 Súdwest-Fryslân: Intro, Thema’s, Vervolg (Exclusief Gebieden).”
- Brundtland Commission. 1987. “Our Common Future.” United Nations.
- Bryman, Alan. 2016. *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chalmers. 2018. “Staff | John Holmberg.” www.Chalmers.se. August 20, 2018. <https://www.chalmers.se/en/Staff/Pages/john-holmberg.aspx>.
- Coenen, Frans. 2000. “Local Agenda 21; a Democratisation Reform in the Netherlands?” University of Twente.
- Czarniawska, Barbara. 2002. *A Tale of Three Cities : Or the Glocalization of City Management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Czarniawaska, Barbara. 2014. *A Theory of Organizing*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Galli, Alessandro, Gordana Đurović, Laurel Hanscom, and Jelena Knežević. 2018. "Think Globally, Act Locally: Implementing the Sustainable Development Goals in Montenegro." *Environmental Science & Policy* 84 (June): 159–69.
- Gemeente Leeuwarden. 2018. "Collegeprogramma Gemeente Leeuwarden 2018-2022."
- Gemeente Leeuwarden. 2019. "Leeuwarden Als Global Goals Gemeente | Gemeente Leeuwarden." Leeuwarden. 2019. <https://www.leeuwarden.nl/nl/leeuwarden-als-global-goals-gemeente>.
- Gemeente Súdwest-Fryslân. 2019. "Kadernota 2020 - Vitaal, Gezond En Duurzaam."
- Gerring, John. 2004. "What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good For?" *American Political Science Review* 98 (2): 341–54.
- Giddens, Anthony. 2002. *Runaway World: How Globalization Is Reshaping Our Lives*. London: Profile Books.
- Gieryn, Thomas F. 2000. "A Space for Place in Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26 (1): 463–96.
- Global Compact Cities Programme. n.d. "THE CITY SCAN." Global Compact Cities Programme. Accessed March 20, 2020. <https://citiesprogramme.org/participate/the-city-scan/>.
- Global Taskforce. 2016. "Global Taskforce Calls for the Localization of the SDGs at the High Level Political Forum." Global Taskforce. July 31, 2016. <https://www.global-taskforce.org/global-taskforce-calls-localization-sdgs-high-level-political-forum>.
- Global Taskforce, UN Habitat, and UNDP. n.d. "Roadmap for Localizing the SDGs: Implementation and Monitoring at Subnational Level." Global Taskforce for Local and Regional Governments.
- Goteborg. n.d. "Welcome to the World's Most Sustainable Destination." Goteborg.Com. Accessed March 23, 2020. <https://www.goteborg.com/en/sustainability/>.
- Göteborgsregionen. 2020. "Strategisk Inriktning 2020–2023."
- Göteborgsregionen. n.d. "Göteborgsregionen (GR)." Goteborgsregionen.Se. Göteborgsregionens kommunalförbund (GR). Accessed November 11, 2019. <https://goteborgsregionen.se/toppmenyn/omgoteborgsregionen/inenglish.4.5f30b95110fd8ec51a8000187.html>.
- Göteborgs Stad. n.d. "Kort Kommunfakta." Goteborg.Se. Accessed March 19, 2020. <https://goteborg.se/wps/portal/start/kommun-o-politik/kommunfakta/kort-kommunfakta/>.

- Guetterman, Timothy C, Tammy Chang, Melissa DeJonckheere, Tanmay Basu, Elizabeth Scruggs, and VG Vinod Vydiswaran. 2018. "Augmenting Qualitative Text Analysis with Natural Language Processing: Methodological Study." *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 20 (6): e231-p1-13.
- Härryda Kommun. 2019. "Kommunfakta - Härryda Kommuns Webbplats." [Www.Harryda.Se](http://www.harryda.se). 2019.
<https://www.harryda.se/kommunochpolitik/kommunfakta.4.495f377d12fde1a72be800037087.html>.
- Bjorn Hettne. 2009. *Thinking about Development*. London ; New York: Zed Books.
- Hirst, Paul, Grahame Thompson, and Simon Bromley. 2009. *Globalization in Question*. Cambridge; Malden: Polity Press.
- Jones, Peter, and Daphne Comfort. 2019. "Localising the Sustainable Development Goals." *Town and Country Planning*, 132–36.
- Kefalas, A.G. 1998. "Think Globally, Act Locally." *Thunderbird International Business Review* 40 (6): 547–62.
- Keil, Roger. 1998. "Globalization Makes States: Perspectives of Local Governance in the Age of the World City." *Review of International Political Economy* 5 (4): 616–46.
- Kellner, Douglas. 2002. "Theorizing Globalization." *Sociological Theory* 20 (3): 285–305.
- Khondker, Habibul Haque. 2005. "Globalisation to Glocalisation: A Conceptual Exploration." *Intellectual Discourse* 13 (2): 181–99.
- Kolada. n.d. "Kolada." Kolada.Se. Accessed January 17, 2020.
https://www.kolada.se/?_p=jamforelse&unit_id=16699.
- Kraidy, Marwan M. 2003. "Glocalisation." *Journal of International Communication* 9 (2): 29–49.
- Kuckartz, Udo. 2013. "Three Basic Methods of Qualitative Text Analysis." In *Qualitative Text Analysis: A Guide to Methods, Practice & Using Software*, 65–120. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Lemos, Maria Carmen, and Arun Agrawal. 2006. "Environmental Governance." *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 31 (1): 297–325.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael S, Alan Bryman, and Tim Futing Liao. 2004. *The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Mackensen, Karsten, and Uta Wille. 1999. "Qualitative Text Analysis Supported by Conceptual Data System." *Quality & Quantity* 33: 135–56.

- Mair, Simon, Aled Jones, Jonathan Ward, Ian Christie, Angela Druckham, and Fergus Lyon. 2017. "A Critical Review of the Role of Indicators in Implementing the Sustainable Development Goals." *Handbook of Sustainability Science*, 1–16.
- Nilsson, Måns, Elinor Chisholm, David Griggs, Philippa Howden-Chapman, David McCollum, Peter Messerli, Barbara Neumann, Anne-Sophie Stevance, Martin Visbeck, and Mark Stafford-Smith. 2018. "Mapping Interactions between the Sustainable Development Goals: Lessons Learned and Ways Forward." *Sustainability Science* 13 (6): 1489–1503.
- Overheid.nl. 2018a. "Contactgegevens Gemeente Leeuwarden | Overheid.NL." Overheid.NL. 2018. https://almanak.overheid.nl/32728/Gemeente_Leeuwarden.
- Overheid.nl. 2018b. "Contactgegevens Gemeente Súdwest-Fryslân | Overheid.NL." Overheid.NL. 2018. https://almanak.overheid.nl/26708/Gemeente_Sudwest_Fryslan.
- Oxford English Dictionary. n.d. "Best, Adj., n.1, and Adv." Www.Oed.Com. Accessed February 28, 2020. <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/18180?redirectedFrom=best-case#contentWrapper>.
- Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. n.d.a "Definition: Global." Oxfordlearnersdictionaries.Com. Accessed January 30, 2020. <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/global?q=global>.
- Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. n.d.b "Definition: Glocal." Oxfordlearnersdictionaries.Com. Accessed January 30, 2020. <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/glocal?q=glocal>.
- Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. n.d.c "Definition: Local." Oxfordlearnersdictionaries.Com. Accessed January 30, 2020. https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/local_1?q=local.
- Prugh, Thomas, Robert Costanza, and Herman E Daly. 2000. *The Local Politics of Global Sustainability*. Washington: Island Press.
- Radhakrishnan, Smitha. 2010. "Limiting Theory: Rethinking Approaches to Cultures of Globalization." In *Handbook of Globalization Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Reddy, P.S. 2016. "Localising the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): The Role of Local Governments in Context." *African Journal of Public Affairs* 9 (2): 1–15.
- Revi, Aromar, Chaitanya Kanuri, Jessica Espey, and Holger Kuhle. 2016. "Getting Started with the SDGs in Cities: A Guide for Stakeholders." Sustainable Development Solutions Network.

- Reyers, Belinda, Mark Stafford-Smith, Karl-Heinz Erb, Robert J Scholes, and Odirilwe Selomane. 2017. "Essential Variables Help to Focus Sustainable Development Goals Monitoring." *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 26–27 (June): 97–105.
- Ritzer, G. (2004) 2006. *The Globalization of Nothing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- RKA. 2019. "Agenda 2030 - Nyckeltal För Kommuner Och Regioner Vägledning." *Kolada.Se*. RKA.
- RKA. 2020. "Agenda 2030 - Nyckeltal." *Www.Rka.Nu*. January 14, 2020. <http://www.rka.nu/agenda2030.2868.html>.
- Robertson, Roland. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: SAGE.
- Robertson, Roland. 2012. "Globalisation or Glocalisation?" *Journal of International Communication* 18 (2): 191–208.
- Roudometof, Victor. 2016. "Theorizing Glocalization." *European Journal of Social Theory* 19 (3): 391–408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431015605443>.
- Roudometof, Victor. 2019. "Recovering the Local: From Glocalization to Localization." *Current Sociology* 67 (6): 801–17.
- Scholte, Jan Aart. 2005. *Globalization : A Critical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Slack, Lucy. 2015. "The Post-2015 Global Agenda – a Role for Local Government." *Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance*, June, 3–11.
- Sneddon, Chris, Richard B. Howarth, and Richard B. Norgaard. 2006. "Sustainable Development in a Post-Brundtland World." *Ecological Economics* 57 (2): 253–68.
- Stafford-Smith, Mark, David Griggs, Owen Gaffney, Farooq Ullah, Belinda Reyers, Norichika Kanie, Bjorn Stigson, Paul Shrivastava, Melissa Leach, and Deborah O’Connell. 2017. "Integration: The Key to Implementing the Sustainable Development Goals." *Sustainability Science* 12 (6): 911–19.
- Standing, G. 2014. "Chapter 1: Denizens and the Precariat." In *A Precariat Charter*, 1–32. London: Bloomsbury.
- Steiner, Achim. 2017. "Localizing the Implementation of the SDGs." UNDP. UNDP. October 12, 2017. <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/news-centre/speeches/2017/localizing-the-implementation-of-the-sustainable-development-goals.html>.
- Stuart, Elizabeth, and Jessica Woodroffe. 2016. "Leaving No-One behind: Can the Sustainable Development Goals Succeed Where the Millennium Development Goals Lacked?" *Gender & Development* 24 (1): 69–81.

- Swyngedouw, Erik. 2004. "Globalisation or 'Glocalisation'? Networks, Territories and Rescaling." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17 (1): 25–48.
- Trott, Christina. 2011. "What Does Globally Responsibility Leadership Mean to Me?" *Global Responsibility N4*, 2011.
- UN Habitat, Global Taskforce, and UNDP. 2015. "Localizing the Post-2015 Development Agenda." United Nations Development Group.
- United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG). 2015. "The Sustainable Development Goals: What Local Governments Need to Know." UCLG.
- United Nations. 2015. "Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/RES/70/1)." United Nations.
- United Nations. 2017. "Global Indicator Framework for the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development." United Nations.
- United Nations. 2020. "UN Documentation: Environment: Major Conferences and Reports." Un.Org. January 9, 2020. <https://research.un.org/en/docs/environment/conferences>.
- United Nations. n.d. "About the Sustainable Development Goals." United Nations Sustainable Development. Accessed December 9, 2019a. <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>.
- United Nations. n.d. "Sustainable Development Goal 17." Goal 17: Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform. Accessed November 2, 2019b. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg17>.
- United Nations. n.d. "United Nations Millennium Development Goals." Un.Org. Accessed December 9, 2019c. <https://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>.
- Valencia, Sandra C. 2019. "Localisation of the 2030 Agenda and Its Sustainable Development Goals in Gothenburg, Sweden."
- VNG. n.d. "Praktijkvoorbeelden Global Goals." VNG. Accessed January 16, 2020. <https://vng.nl/artikelen/praktijkvoorbeelden-global-goals>.
- VNG International. 2018. "De Global Goals in Het Gemeentelijk Beleid: Een Handreiking Voor Nederlandse Gemeenten." VNG International.
- VNG International. n.d. "Municipalities4GlobalGoals." Vng-International.Nl. Accessed January 11, 2020. <https://www.vng-international.nl/sustainable-development-goals>.
- VNG International, and European Commission. n.d. "Menukaart." VNG International.
- Voegtlin, Christian, and Andreas Georg Scherer. 2015. "Responsible Innovation and the Innovation of Responsibility: Governing Sustainable Development in a Globalized World." *Journal of Business Ethics* 143 (2): 227–43.

- Weitz, Nina, Måns Nilsson, and Marion Davis. 2014. "A Nexus Approach to the Post-2015 Agenda: Formulating Integrated Water, Energy, and Food SDGs." *SAIS Review of International Affairs* 34 (2): 37–50.
- Wielenga, Wendelin. 2019. "Leren Door Experimenteren: Pilots in Súdwest-Fryslân." Samen Súdwest-Fryslân. May 10, 2019.
<https://www.samensudwestfryslan.nl/de+omgevingswet/omgevingsvisie+nieuws/1343688.aspx>.
- Yanow, Dvora, Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, and Maria José Freitas. 2012. "Case Study Research in Political Science." In *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research*, edited by Albert J. Mills, Gabrielle Durepos, and Elden Wiebe, 109–14. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Zainal, Zaidah. 2007. "Case Study as a Research Method." *Jurnal Kemanusiaan* 9: 1–6.

Appendix

Appendix 1 – The Sustainable Development Goals

The refined list of Goals, targets and indicators are displayed in the report “Global Indicator Framework for the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” published by the United Nations (2017). Below, the 17 goals are outlined.

Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere

Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture

Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages

Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all

Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls

Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all

Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all

Goal 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all

Goal 9: Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation

Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries

Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns

Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts

Goal 14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development

Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Goal 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development

Appendix 2 – Semi-structured Interview Questions

- Has your municipality started to incorporate the SDGs into their strategy or which steps have been taken regarding the SDGs and will be taken in the future?
- What are the driving forces behind the implementation of the SDGs according to you? (forced from a national level, triggered by fashion, personal interest)
- Has (and how) the municipality decided on specific targets & indicators?
- Has there been assistance (certain documents/guides from higher levels/other institutions) on how to translate the global goals into local policies/strategies?
- Will you edit/propose regulation according to the goals or will you choose goals fitting your regulation?
- Do you feel having a freedom of choosing your own strategy regarding the implementation?
- Is the implementation of the SDGs mainly focussed on your region or have you considered the wider/long-term effect for the global sphere?
- Does the region mostly focus on short- or long-term goals/indicators? Why?
 - o Are elections influencing the short/long term strategies around the SDGs?
- Do you face any difficulties translating, implementing or executing the SDGs?
- Do you feel that some indicators are overlapping or contradicting?
- Will you focus mostly on internal action (implementation) or external actions (raising awareness within the community)?
- Will other sectors be actively be included in the execution of the SDGs?
- Are you financially stimulated by a national or supra-national level? (which would increase your financial resources for implementation)
- Do you exchange knowledge on implementation strategies with other municipalities, overarching organisations or internationally?
- Will the SDGs support, improve or contradict your current sustainable development strategies?
- Have you been able to start monitoring? Or do you have an idea how you will be monitoring your progress? Will you be using the national monitoring system?
- Do you prefer a personalised monitoring system or the national one?
- What are your biggest achievements so far?
- What are the main challenges in the near future?

Appendix 3 – Interview Participants

An overview of all interviewees, the date of conducting the interview and its in-text reference.

Göteborgsregionen – 04/03/2020

Referred in text as: (Interview Göteborgsregionen 2020)

- Region planner: Johnstone, S.

Göteborg Stad – 20/03/2020

Referred in text as: (Interview Göteborg Stad 2020)

- Planning leader of the department of Climate and Environment: Pettersson, S.

Municipality of Ale – 31/03/2020

Referred in text as: (Interview Ale 2020)

- Development officer: Widbom, J.

Municipality of Härryda – 01/04/2020

Referred in text as: (Interview Härryda 2020)

- Development leader sustainability: Östman, A.

Municipality of Leeuwarden – 11/02/2020

Referred in text as: (Interview Leeuwarden 2020)

- Employee at the Economic Department: Oppers, E.

Municipality of Súdwest-Fryslân – 10/02/2020

Referred in text as: (Interview SWF 2020)

- Strategic advisor and project manager of the SDGs: Willemsma, Y.
- Programme manager of the Environment and Planning Act: Popkema, E.

Vereniging voor Nederlandse Gemeenten (VNG) – 25/02/2020

Referred in text as: (Interview VNG 2020)

- Project Manager: Vermeer, E.